

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

MAY 27 1940

PAGE

SCOTT-CRAIG, T. S. K.—Milton's Use of Wolleb and Ames,	403
FINK, Z. S.—The Date of Milton's 'Proposals for a Firme Government,'	407
SCOTT, FLORENCE R.—The Marriages of Sir Robert Howard,	410
SLOANE, WILLIAM.—Some Plagiarisms in 17th Century Books of Advice to Children,	416
THOMAS, SIDNEY.—"Hobgoblin Runne Away with the Garland of Apollo,"	418
ROELLINGER, F. X.—E. S. Dallas in Trollope's 'Autobiography,'	422
SIMISON, BARBARA D.—The Letters of R. W. Emerson: Addenda,	425
BRAUNLICH, ALICE F.—Parallels to Some Passages in 'Prometheus Unbound,'	428
MOORE, J. R.—Evidence for Defoe's Authorship of 'The Memoirs of Captain Carleton,'	430
HOOK, J. N.—Three Imitations of Spenser,	431
WASSERMAN, E. R.—Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments,"	432
KURRELMAYER, W.—Vier Briefe aus Gleims Freundeskreise,	433
KURRELMAYER, W.—Ein Brief Schillers an Anton von Klein,	441
CIORANESCU, AL.—Alphonse de Rambervilliers, Ligneux,	442
SPITZER, LEO.—A. Fr. 'Echarevotée "Ecorchée,"	447
MOSSNER, E. C.—Rousseau Hero-Worship,	449
PRIVITERA, J. F.—The Date of Mme Deshoulières's Parody of 'le Cid,'	451
PARKER, J. H.—A Possible Source of a 'jeu de scène' in Molière's 'Ecole des maris,'	453
ADAMS, N. B. AND SALLEY, W. C.—A Note on the Sources of "Venganza Catalana,"	454

REVIEWS:—

J. E. BERNARD, JR., The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude; G. M. GREENE-WALD Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in "King John"; J. A. MITCHELL (ed.), <i>The Wards</i> by T. NEALE; R. H. WEST, <i>The Invisible World</i> ; B. SIEBECK, <i>Das Bild Sir Philip Sidney's</i> ; R. WOLLENBERG, <i>Shakespeare Persönliches aus Welt und Werk</i> ; J. MAIB, <i>The Fourth Forger</i> ; A. K. MCILWRAITH (ed.), <i>Five Elizabethan Tragedies</i> ; B. COLES, <i>Macbeth</i> ; L. L. SCHÜCKING, <i>Die Zusätze zur "Spanish Tragedy"</i> ; The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero; R. W. CHAMBERS, <i>The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure</i> ; W. FRANZ, <i>Die Sprache Shakespeares</i> ; C. N. MENTON, <i>Shakespeare Criticism</i> ; M. VAN DOREN, <i>Shakespeare</i> ; T. SPENCER and M. VAN DOREN, <i>Studies in Metaphysical Poetry</i> ; H. W. WELLS, <i>Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights</i> . [T. W. Baldwin.]	455
J. Q. ADAMS (ed.), <i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i> by WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. [W. W. Greg.]	462
E. DE SELINCOURT (ed.), <i>The Letters of W. and D. Wordsworth</i> . [R. D. Havens.]	464
L. HANSON, <i>The Life of S. T. Coleridge</i> ; E. L. GRIGGS (ed.), <i>Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of G. M. Harper</i> . [E. O. Baldwin.]	466
<i>Lingua Nostra</i> . [Leo Spitzer.]	469
L. G. KRAKEUR, <i>La Correspondance de Diderot</i> . [H. Dieckmann.]	472
W. J. BURKE, <i>The Literature of Slang</i> . [J. L. Kuehse.]	473
R. KIRK and C. M. HALL (eds.), <i>Two Bookes of Constance</i> by I. LIPSIVS. [D. C. Allen.]	475
G. SCHNEURWEGER (ed.), <i>Nicholas Udall's Roister Doister</i> . [R. H. Bowdler.]	476

BRIEF MENTION: E. PANOFKY, *Studies in Iconology*; A. L. READE, *Johnsonian Gleanings*, 478

CORRESPONDENCE: Chaucer's Monk; As by the Whelp Chastised is the Leon; Baudelaire and Bandy, 480

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *EE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

JUST PUBLISHED

A HISTORY OF FRENCH DRAMATIC LITERATURE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

PART IV, THE PERIOD OF RACINE
1673—1700

By HENRY CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Professor of French Literature in the Johns Hopkins University

In two volumes, 996 pages, cloth, \$10

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

THE OLD GERMANIC PRINCIPLES OF NAME-GIVING

BY

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Assistant Professor of English Louisiana State University

This study falls into two parts, one concerned with the naming of those Germanic tribes who migrated to England, the other with those who remained on the Continent. After an introduction are to be found chapters on the royal families of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Lindsey, Mercia, Bernicia, Deira, and Wessex. Then follows a long chapter dealing with the Old English non-royal families, in which an attempt is made to find out in what ways the names of those not of the royal blood differ from those of their rulers. The next chapter, which treats Old English poetry, is in the main a consideration of the Beowulfian genealogies. Chapters on the Scandinavians, the Merovingians, the Goths, the Langobards, the Burgundians and some others, together with a conclusion, complete the volume. There is a bibliography, and an extensive index of names.

xii + 299 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$4.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1896.

Editors
on the
manuscript
articles
to the
titles of
Quo-
3, not
, MP.
editors
business

who
duc-
lsey,
Old
ames
hich
gies.
ians
phy,



Modern Language Notes

Volume LV

JUNE, 1940

Number 6

MILTON'S USE OF WOLLEB AND AMES

In his recent illuminating study of Milton's Christian doctrine,¹ Professor Sewell, expanding earlier articles, has delved further into the relationship of Milton's thought to that of the seventeenth century Calvinist theologians, and has found detailed indebtedness to Wolleb's *Compendium* and Ames's *Medulla*; but at several crucial points I believe it can be shown that Mr. Sewell has missed the true interpretation of Milton's use of these authors.

We are told, for example, that there is evidence of significant omissions in the *De Doctrina*, the most notable being the treatment of Satan compared with the picture in *Paradise Lost*. It is argued that the epic shows considerable indebtedness to Ames, who was also Milton's source for an earlier and ampler version of the *De Doctrina*, on the subject; when Milton lost interest in Satan, the extended treatment was omitted or cancelled.² This is a rather unwarranted speculation; for Milton was confessedly using Wolleb as well as Ames as a source, and at this point follows Wolleb rather closely. Mr. Maurice Kelley, in a review³ of Mr. Sewell's book, has already expressed his dissatisfaction with the latter's use of the *argumentum e silentio*; but I hope to go further and show why the speculation is unwarranted. The mere fact that Wolleb's exposition is no longer than Milton's is itself enough to cast doubt on the idea that Milton must once have felt that an extended treatment of Satan would be expected from him in a work on systematic theology. But we can go further. The opening part of Milton's treatment of the Fall, both before and after that of Satan, is organically related to (is, indeed, a condensation of) the corresponding section in the *Com-*

¹ A. Sewell, *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine* (London, 1939).

² *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³ M. Kelley, *MP.*, xxxvii (1939), 103.

pendium. (And if this is true, then this section of the *De Doctrina*, far from being part of a late revision, may well be as early as any.)

If one omits from Wolleb the material to which there is no parallel in Milton, one finds the same topics treated in identical order; i. e., God's Providence or government seen in the state of sin and misery; definition of sin on the basis of 1 John 3, 4; explanation that in the *John* passage, the word Law refers both to the law of nature or conscience and to the special commands and prohibitions of God; sin of Adam and Eve connected with the forbidden tree; place of the Devil and of the human will in the Fall; sin of Adam and Eve; the catalogue of all crimes. This is in itself striking; but more so is both the presence and absence of verbal parallelism. Every young instructor, preparing his first lectures, has, I suppose, drawn largely on previous authorities; but he is careful to re-phrase his sources. So Milton, preparing his outline of dogmatics, might well introduce synonyms to cover his real indebtedness. I append and number the relevant passages so that the closeness of the parallels may be observed.

De Doctrina,⁴ pp. 178-180.

- 1) Providentia Dei lapsum hominis respiciens peccato eius et miseria inde consecuta cernitur, tum in eius restitutione.
- 2) Peccatum, uti ab ipso Apostolo definitur, est *avopla*, seu legis transgressio, 1 Ioan. iii. 4.
- 3) Legis nomine primario hic intelligitur, illa hominis menti insita et innata: deinde illa ore Dei prolata; Gen. ii. 17. *de isto ne comedit*: nam lex per Mosen scripta longe posterior fuit: de qua Rom. ii. 12 quicunque sine lege peccaverunt, sine lege quoque peribunt.
- 4) Peccatum est vel omnium hominum commune vel cuiusque proprium. Omnium commune, quod abiecta prorsus obedientia, fructoque vetitae arboris degustato, primi parentes atque in iis omnes eorum posterius commiserunt.
- 5) Primi parentes: Gen. iii. 6. *accepit mulier de fructu, et comedit, et dedit viro, qui comedit*. hinc 1 Tim. ii. 14. *Adam non fuit seductus, sed mulier seducta, causa transgressionis fuit*. Peccatum hoc primum ab instigatione diaboli fuit, ut ex gesta re constat Gen. iii. et 1 Ioan. iii. 8. *qui facit peccatum, ex diabolo est; quoniam a principio diabolus peccat*. Deinde a natura hominis non immutabili profectum, ex qua ille, sicut antea diabolus, *in veritate non perstitit*, Ioan. viii. 44. neque suam originem servavit, sed domicilium reliquit, Iudae 6.

⁴ The references here and throughout are to the Columbia edition of Milton's works.

- 6) et si quis attentius paulo animadvertat, atrocissimum, et totius legis transgressionem iniuria dixerit.

Sub hoc enim quid non perpetravit homo, credulitate in Satanam, incredulitate in Deum iuxta damnandus, infidelis, ingratus, inobsequens, gulosus, uxorius hic, mariti illa observantior, uterque suae prolis, totius generis humani, parricida, fur, et alieni raptor, sacrilegus, fallax, divinitatis insidiosus, et indignus affectator, superbus, arrogans.

Compendium,⁵ pp. 40-42.

- 1) Tantum de gubernatione hominis in statu innocentiae. Gubernatio hominis in statu miseriae est, qua Deus hominem in peccatum sponte prolapsus variis miseriis justo iudicio subiecit. Consistit igitur hic status in peccato, et miseriis peccatum consequentibus.
- 2) Peccatum est ἀνομία, seu quicquid Legi divini repugnat.
- 3) I Joh. iii. 4. Legis nomine hoc loco tum praecepta et interdicta homini primitus proposita, tum Lex Naturae cordi ejus insculpta intelligitur. De Legis autem post lapsum instauratione ac ampliatione infra agetur suo loco.
- 4) Peccatum primum est, aut ex primo ortum.

Primum peccatum est inobedientia primorum parentum, qua Dei interdictum de arbore scientiae boni et mali sunt transgressi.

- 5) Causa ejus προκαταρκτική fuit, antiqua illius serpentis, Satanae, instinctus et persuasio.

Causa προηγουμένη erat, voluntas hominis, per se quidem ad bonum et malum indifferens, sed Satanae persuasionem ad malum inflexa.

- 6) Partes hujus lapsus si spectes, recte totius legis naturalis transgressionem dixeris.

Peccavit enim homo incredulitate, diffidentia, ἀχαριστία, idololatria, qua a Deo deficit, et ex seipso idolum facere sategit, Verbi Dei contemptu, rebellionem, homicidio, intemperantia, furto, rei quae alienae, inconsulto domino, contrectatione, falsi testimonii assensu, ambitiosa denique altioris dignitatis, imo gloriae soli Deo competentis, affectatione. Unde nimis stricte peccatum hoc per intemperantiam, ambitionem, aut superbiam definitur.

Secondly, Mr. Sewell declares that there are traces in the *De Doctrina* of Milton's not always having held the view—*omnia ex Deo*—which dominates the treatment of creation in the treatise. He notices that Milton distinguishes between God's generation of the Son out of his own substance, and the less intimate formation of

⁵ J. Wollebius, *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (London, 1760). These parallels seem to have been passed over in Mr. Kelley's otherwise exhaustive article, "Milton's Debt to Wollebi's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*," in *PMLA*, L (1935), 156 ff.

Adam from the dust of the earth;⁶ he notices also that Milton, although he had declared that the world (being "out of God") was indestructible, later⁷ considers it of no importance to determine whether the destruction of the substance of the world may take place. Now, inasmuch as Milton was attempting to use orthodox terms in an unorthodox way, to say that God "created" the world and yet mean that God did not "create out of nothing," it would be surprising indeed if there were no traces of orthodox teaching here and there; which is the very most we can find, in either of the passages cited. But Mr. Sewell believes he can show traces⁸ not of orthodoxy but of what he calls the "logical" view that God fashioned the worlds out of a pre-existent substance or matter other than God; and his basis for the statement is the really extraordinary claim that such views are to be found in Wolleb.

It is true that Wolleb does distinguish two kinds of creation, the one *ex nihilo*, the other *ex materia naturaliter inhabili*; but it is surely obvious what a seventeenth-century Biblical theologian, tied to the *Genesis* story, had in mind—that the miraculous creative power of God was shown not only in creating inorganic matter out of nothing, but also in making man out of the already created dust of the ground. As Wolleb puts it: "Creare, non tantum est ex nihilo aliquid facere, sed etiam ex materia inhabili supra naturae vires aliquid producere";⁹ or again: "Triplex miraculosa corporis humani productio in Scripturis traditur. Prima, ex pulvere terrae sine patre et matre. Secunda, ex costa Adami sine matre. Tertia, ex Virgine beatae sanguine sine patre."¹⁰ There is thus no ground for holding that Milton got from Wolleb any view that the worlds, far from being created out of nothing, were fashioned out of a pre-existent dust, which the "Creator" simply utilized.

Lastly, "Milton found in Ames's *Medulla* the idea which became central in his view of the process by which man may finally become one with God"; for in Ames's view "all things tend towards God from whom they proceed."¹¹ Mr. Sewell unaccountably misunderstands Ames, who carefully explains what he means. "Now naturall things tend unto God. 1. In that they declare God's glory. 2. That they give occasion to us to knowe, and seeke God. 3. In that they

⁶ *De Doctrina*, XIV, 187.

⁷ *Ibid.*, XVI, 369.

⁸ Sewell, *op. cit.*, pp. 15 and 40.

⁹ Wolleb, *op. cit.*, I, v; p. 27.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, v; p. 30.

¹¹ Sewell, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

sustaine our life, that we may live well unto God."¹² There is no trace here of an evolutionary universe becoming more and more divine; nor is there any parallel drawn between the destiny of the natural world and that of man. A better analogy to Milton's "scale of perfection" might have been found in a later chapter of Ames, where he mentions God's promise to man "of continuing animall life and of exalting it afterward to spirituall,"¹³ an idea which, however, Milton need not have borrowed from Ames, since it was common stock of both Catholicism and Protestantism; it refers moreover to pre-lapsarian conditions and casts no light on how "man may finally become one with God." In Ames's view at least, man's eternal welfare depends, since the Fall, radically on the mediation of Christ.

The relation of Milton's thought to that of Ames and Wolleb is, as Mr. Sewell has helped to show, often close in detail; but it is misrepresented by him on numerous occasions, of which these are but samples. In any case, neither Milton's theological originality, nor his intellectual and imaginative debt to Christian thought, can be appreciated unless we extend our gaze beyond the Calvinist epigoni to the men who created Christian dogma.

T. S. K. SCOTT-CRAIG

Hobart College

THE DATE OF MILTON'S PROPOSALLS FOR A FIRME GOVERNMENT

In the eighteenth volume of the *Columbia Milton* is printed, possibly for the first time, a little known prose work of the poet's of which the full title is *Proposalls of Certaine Expedients for the Prevention of a Civill War Now Feard, & the Settling of a Firme Government*. The *Columbia* editors, Professors Mabbott and French, who are apparently the only ones who have dealt with this document, do not directly discuss its date, though the slender evidence they present to suggest that it may have been printed as a separate tract in 1659 leaves the reader to infer that it was composed some-

¹² W. Ames, *Medulla Theologica*, translated by himself as *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, n. d.), p. 106.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

time during that year.¹ I believe it is possible to show that the *Proposalls* was written between October 20 and December 26, 1659.

On the 20th October, 1659, Milton addressed to an unknown friend the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*, a work which the Columbia editors curiously fail to mention in their remarks on the relation of the *Proposalls* to Milton's other political writings. The *Proposalls* is like this letter in containing the suggestion that the principal army chiefs be given life tenure,² a suggestion which appears in neither edition of *The Ready and Easy Way* nor in the *Letter to Monk*, which cannot be earlier than February, 1660.³ The idea was a concession to the demands of the situation which prevailed in the last months of 1659 when the army regime was dominant in London after Lambert's coup on the 13 October. It was no essential part of Milton's political philosophy, as the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth* itself makes clear,⁴ and with the collapse of the army regime in the last days of the year we hear no more of it. Hence the *Proposalls* is earlier in date than either *The Ready and Easy Way* or the *Letter to Monk*. Indeed it must be more than a month earlier than *The Ready and Easy Way*, since on the 26 December, 1659, Parliament resumed its sitting, and Milton's suggestion that the Parliament be again treated with to sit shows conclusively that he was writing before this event occurred and even before it became obvious that it was going to occur.

On the other hand, the *Proposalls* contains an emphatic statement that members of the grand or supreme council should have life tenure. This principle is a central feature of both *The Ready and Easy Way* and the *Letter to Monk*.⁵ Now it is true that the idea appears also in the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*,⁶ but it is there much less insistently advocated than in the later documents. Milton, indeed, goes so far as to say that "whether

¹ See their note to the Columbia text, p. 501, and their earlier observations in *N. & Q.*, CLXXIII, 66, 24 July, 1937.

² VI, 105. This and all subsequent references to Milton's works are to the Columbia edition.

³ As Professor E. M. Clark points out in his edition of *The Ready and Easy Way* (New Haven, 1915), pp. x ff., the first edition was composed in the main between the 4 February and the 21 February, 1660. The *Letter to Monk* is, of course, not earlier.

⁴ VI, 102-03.

⁵ VI, 126, 108-09.

⁶ VI, 105.

the Civil Government be an annual Democracy, or a perpetual Aristocracy, is not to me a Consideration for the Extremities wherein we are,"⁷ but in *The Ready and Easy Way* he will admit as an alternative to life tenure only a restricted rotation, and he argues against this with all the resources at his command.⁸ Clearly the movement of Milton's thought from October, 1659, to February, 1660, was toward greater insistence on the principle of life tenure for members of the supreme council and less willingness to make concessions regarding it. From these circumstances it would seem that the *Proposalls* is certainly later than the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*. There are other facts which point to the same conclusion. The *Letter* is the product of obvious haste. Its ideas are not clearly and sharply defined, and there is evidence, as Masson pointed out,⁹ that it was written when Milton, preoccupied with the question of ecclesiastical reform, was jolted by Lambert's coup into realization that a political settlement was the real question of the hour. On the other hand, the ideas in the *Proposalls*, like those in *The Ready and Easy Way*, are sharply and definitely defined in a manner which indicates that they were considered judgments.

I conclude that the *Proposalls* was written between the 20 October and the 26 December, 1659, and certainly at least some days removed from either extreme. This date means that the document, whether it be an independent tract, as Professors Mabbott and French believe,¹⁰ or whether it is an early draft of *The Ready and Easy Way*, as was suggested in the auction catalogue which listed it,¹¹ marks a stage in the development of Milton's political thought in the crucial period from October, 1659, to February, 1660; and it is possibly in this fact that its main significance resides. Inasmuch as the proposal concerning the life tenure of the army officers is the main difference between it and *The Ready and Easy Way*, the *Proposalls* shows that in most essentials the ideas which Milton embodied in February in his elaborated plan for a free commonwealth had taken definite form in his mind before the end of the preceding year.¹² The point is not unimportant, for a comparison

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Life of Milton*, v, 628.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹ vi, 127 ff.

¹⁰ xviii, 501.

¹² Common to the two works are the setting up of abjuration of a single person as a requirement for eligibility to the government; the idea that the attempt to control religion is the source of many, if indeed not most, of

of the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth* and *The Ready and Easy Way* shows clearly, as I have pointed out, that Milton's ideas on the structure of the government underwent in some respects both modification and development in the period of more than three months between the two works.

Z. S. FINK

Northwestern University

THE MARRIAGES OF SIR ROBERT HOWARD

The article concerning Sir Robert Howard in the *Dictionary of National Biography* presents a rather confused account of his marital affairs. An early sentence refers to a "hostile pamphleteer" who stated that "many other places and boons he has had, but his W—— Uphill spends all and now refuses to marry him."¹ A little further along occurs the statement: "26 Feb. 1692 he married Annabella Dives (aged 18) a maid of honor." Then "Howard's first wife whom he married 1 Feb. 1645/46 was Ann dau. of Rd. Kingsmill of Malshanger Church Oakley, Hants; his second wife was Lady Honora O'Brien, dau. of Earl of Thomond . . . whom he married at Wooten Bassett 10 Aug. 1665. . . . He was survived by Thomas Howard (1651-1701) his son and heir probably by his second wife"—an unexpected statement in view of the fact that

the commotions which disturb civil governments; and the proposals that the name of the supreme body be changed from Parliament to the Grand Council, that the members of this council sit for life subject to proper behavior, that the council be given powers of a mixed legislative and executive character, that a smaller Council of State be selected as a sort of executive committee, that this smaller council be chosen by the Grand Council, that its membership be not limited to those sitting in the Grand Council, that the administration of justice be left to the local governments, that disputes between men of different counties be settled in a central court, that with the government thus once settled, time would be available for educational and other reforms throughout the country. There are a few minor differences, principally as regards the method of electing the Grand Council, though the two tracts agree on the principle involved. The two works are not entirely parallel in their order of development, but there are striking similarities between them both in this respect and in phraseology.

¹ A seasonable Argument to persuade all Grand Juries in England to petition for a Parl. 1677.

marriage to the Lady Honora had just been given as fourteen years subsequent to his son's birth.

A record of one mistress, three wives, and one son ascribed to the wrong mother required further search. The *Ashstead Records* offered a more surprising entry. Sir Robert married:

I Mrs Uphill—second wife according to Edmondson. . . . If Mrs. Uphill was his first wife, he must have been a widower at 24 as his son, by Lady Honora, was born in 1651.

II Honora O'Brien, coheir of Henry Earl of Thomond. Edm. gives the lady the position of first wife.

III Annabella Dives, said to be the eldest dau. of John Dives, d. 1728.²

A third account, *Memorials of the Howard Family*, states that he had four wives.³ This statement is confirmed by Collins's *Peerage*.⁴

Investigation of original sources was imperative. The Rev. G. Herbert Jeudwine, rector of Church Oakley, Basingstoke, Hants., arranged a visit to his church, where the parish register, a single volume in which all entries since 1559 have been made, yielded the following information:

Sr Robert Howard son of y^e Earle of Berks. and Mrs Anna Kingsmill second daughter of Richard Kingsmill of Malhanger were married y^e first of Februarie 1644. (N. S. 1645)

Mr. Montague Summers, perhaps following the *Dictionary of National Biography*, says 1646 was the date of the marriage, but this is obviously impossible as the oldest son, Robert, was born "Februarie 1645." Under the date 1650 there appears:

Thomas Howard sonne of Sr Robert Howard was baptized the twentie first day of February 1650. (N. S. 1651).

Ann Kingsmill is obviously the mother of Thomas. No record, however, has been found of her death.

On the 10th of August, 1665, Howard married the Lady Honoria (the spelling Honora does not appear in any of the official documents which I found). She was the daughter of Henry, fifth Earl

² A. C. Lomax, *Some Records of the Ashstead Estate and of its Howard Possessors*, Appendix, Pedigree of the Earls of Berkshire. Litchfield, 1873.

³ Henry Howard, *Indications of Memorials, Monuments, Paintings, and Engravings of Persons of the Howard Family* (Corby Castle, 1834), I, 69.

⁴ Arthur Collins, *The Peerage of England*, ed. Brydges, III, 162.

of Thomond, from whom she inherited considerable wealth. A strong royalist, Thomond had been given power of

treating and parleying with Rebels and Traitors. He had twenty shillings a day by grant under the Privy Seal. By will in 1617 he bequeathed £2000 to his daughters Ann and Honora, as an increase in their fortunes. Dying without male heirs his dau. became coheireses.⁵

This date 1617 indicates that the Lady Honoria was several years older than Sir Robert (who was not born until 1626), a fact which may largely account for his indifference to anything but her fortune. In addition to her father's wealth, she inherited extensive holdings from her first husband, Sir Francis Englefield of Wiltshire, who had died in May, 1665. He left her the manor of Wooten Bassett (esteemed at £2000 a year and later sold for £36,000) as well as the adjacent manor house of Vasterne. This latter property had a long and honorable history. Mary I bestowed Vasterne and Wooten Bassett, then part of the Queen's dower lands, upon Sir Francis Englefield early in 1555/6. An ardent Romanist, he forfeited under Elizabeth, but after his execution in 1587 for mixing in the affairs of Mary, Queen of Scots, the family regained possession.⁶ The Lady Honoria was in every respect the equal of Howard, now a favorite of Charles II, and their marriage was arranged by the king.

Whether Howard had any affection for his second wife we may well question, for by October, 1666, his affair with Susanna Uphill, one of the actresses of the King's Theatre, was well known.⁷ By the following spring his free use of his new wife's money had brought their relations to an impasse. About the middle of March Lady Honoria petitioned for relief because Sir Robert had "fallen far from the promise made at the time of marriage."⁸ On the sixteenth the Lord Chancellor wrote to Lord Arlington that he had begun a reply to his letter "when the king came in. . . . The King having recommended her such a husband, cannot refuse to take notice of her complaint."⁹ On the seventeenth Arlington wrote that the King had referred the case to several eminent noblemen.

⁵ *Ashstead Records*, p. 59.

⁶ Ethel M. Richardson, *The Lion and the Rose* (London, n. d.), p. 257.

⁷ Evelyn, *Diary*, 18 October, 1666.

⁸ *State Papers Domestic*, Entry Book no. 18, p. 246.

⁹ *Ibid.*, v. 194, no. 33.

But apparently nothing was done. On the twenty-first the Lady Honoria, now rather desperate, repeated her petition:

Whereas Sr Robt Howard for a year past hath refused to cohabit wth y^e petier but left her for some time but 6£ a week toward the supporting herselfe family & the keeping of a coach (Tho he and his children are by y^e petier estate enabled to live bontifully) but for the space of five weeks last past, he hath forbidden tradesmen to trust her, wherby she is exposed to much hardship and must be in a starving condition & Sr Robt did declare y^t he would put y^e petier in a chamber & she should live on bread and water & only have 5d a week. And upon severall occasions profes^th y^e petier to submitt & lie at his mercy w^{ch} she dares not doo having already found sorow and crewel usage by him.¹⁰

She asks for an Act of Parliament that she may support herself in a manner "suitable to her birth and fortune." Some settlement of their domestic difficulties was apparently reached, perhaps the Indenture referred to in her will as of 1671. A letter from John Verney 26 April, 1676, states that Sir Robert had "sold Wooten Bassett for £36,000 of which his lady is to have eight."¹¹

The final record in this marriage is found in the will of the Lady Honoria, dated 6 September, 1676, and proved on the 12th of the same month.

I the Lady Honoria Howard wife to Sr Robert Howard knight by vertue of and in pursuance of Power to me allowed by our Indenture bearing date the twentieth day of October in the two and twentieth year of his now Majesties Raigne made between Sr Robert and myselfe . . . do make and ordain this my last will and Testament as followeth First I comend . . . my body to be buried as near as conveniently may be to the place where my former husband Sr Francis Englefield Baronett deceased was buried in the Englefield Church. . . Likewise it is my desire to have noe other monument or Tombe over my dead body than a Convenient Black marble polished which I would have laid over Sr Francis Englefield and myselfe, . . .¹²

Any doubt which these provisions might leave as to her attitude toward Sir Robert is dispelled by a further clause. After a large number of bequests, such as one to the Earl of Anglesey for fifty pounds to buy a mourning ring, ten pounds to the minister who should read her burial service, full mourning and a year's wages to all her servants, fifty pounds to her Executors to buy them mourn-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, v. 218, no. 63.

¹¹ Hist. MSS. Com. 7th Report, appendix, p. 467.

¹² 122 Bence.

ing and another fifty "for a Legacie to buy each of them a ring," there occurs one crisp statement: "Item unto S^r Robert Howard one shilling."

On Saturday, May 2, 1668, there was produced at Lincoln's Inn Fields Shadwell's play called the *Sullen Lovers or the Impertinents*. In this play Sir Robert was openly caricatured as Sir Positive-at-All and Mrs. Uphill as Lady Vaine. Although she had played only small roles, she was one of Killegrew's earliest actresses and was well known to the theatre-going public. Theophilus Cibber wrote of this play:

Thomas Shadwell the poet was so angry with the knight for his supercilious domineering manner of behaving, that he points him out under the name of Sir Positive-At-All, one of the characters in the *Sullen Lovers* or the *Impertinence*; and among the same persons is the Lady Vaine, a Courtesan, which the wits understood to be the mistress of Sir Robert Howard, whom he afterward thought proper to marry.¹³

Mr. Summers in *The Playhouse of Pepys* says that on the death of Howard's second wife (which he erroneously places in 1678) "Susanna Uphill was wedded to her constant admirer."¹⁴ Anthony à Wood referring to the *Sullen Lovers* states:

Among the persons is the Lady Vaine . . . which the wits then understood to be the miss of Sir Robert Howard, whom, after he had for some time kept, he made her his wife.¹⁵

As register after register failed to produce any record of the marriage, I was inclined to doubt whether it had actually taken place. In the official *Westminster Register*, however, I found a reference to "his relict Annabella" as "his fourth wife,"¹⁶ so we may apparently accept as fact that Susanna Uphill was Sir Robert's third wife.

That Annabella Dives was Howard's last wife is accepted by all biographers. Luttrell on Tuesday February 28, 1692/3, wrote, "Sir Robert Howard on Sunday last married young Mrs. Dives, maid of honor to the princesse, aged about 18."¹⁷ She was the daughter of John Dives, esq., Clerk of the Privy Council.¹⁸ The *Ashstead Records* says of her:

¹³ *Lives of the Poets*, III, 58.

¹⁵ *Athenae Oxonienses*, III, 595.

¹⁴ P. 167.

¹⁶ P. 243.

¹⁷ Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs*, III, 45.

¹⁸ *Westminster Register*, p. 243.

THE MARRIAGES OF SIR ROBERT HOWARD 415

In 1698 the songs of Purcell were published . . . with dedication to Lady Howard, who, as there alleged, possessed "extraordinary skill in music." She had been a pupil of Purcell . . . and some of his best music compositions were made for her entertainment and recommended by her performance. Her Ladyship has placed a tablet to his memory in Westminster Abbey.¹⁹

Howard died 3 September, 1698, and was buried in St. John the Baptist's Chapel, Westminster, on the eighth.²⁰ On the day of the funeral Luttrell wrote, "He left by will to his lady 40,000£."²¹ Howard's own will proved 7 September, 1698, indicates a very different attitude toward the young Lady Howard from that shown to Lady Honoria.

I do give devise and bequeath unto my most dear and affectionate wife Dame Annabella Howard all my share part and proportion of all profits benefits and advantages that may in any way arise.²²

Among these benefits and advantages was an estate (estimated by Luttrell to be worth £8,000 a year) which had been bequeathed him by Philadelphia, Lady Wentworth, in her will (dated 2 April, 1696, and proved in May) and which in his will Sir Robert took great pains to guarantee to his wife. His "said loving wife" was made sole executrix. This fact and the signature as witness of "John Dyve" (undoubtedly Annabella's father) proves conclusively that Sir Robert found his fourth marriage highly satisfactory. Only eighteen years of age, a talented musician, with entree to the inner court circle, Lady Howard perhaps did not mind too much that her husband was old and suffered from the gout. She was mistress of his official London residence and of Ashstead, where, six months after her marriage, she had the honor of entertaining the Queen.²³ Moreover, she did not long mourn him, for she "remarried Rev. Edward Martin of Somerton Co. Oxford, and was buried at Hammersmith Midx 7 Sept., 1728."²⁴

FLORENCE R. SCOTT

University of Southern California

¹⁹ P. 55.

²⁰ *Westminster Register*, loc. cit.

²¹ Luttrell, *op. cit.*, IV, 424.

²² 201 Lort.

²³ Luttrell, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

²⁴ *Westminster Register*, p. 243.

SOME PLAGIARISMS IN 17TH CENTURY BOOKS OF
ADVICE TO CHILDREN

In the ideas advanced in the many books of advice to children and youth in the seventeenth century there is naturally a good deal of similarity, for prudent and anxious parents, then as now, were concerned rather with perpetuating the truths of common experience than with testing newfangled theories. But sometimes the verbal similarities in these books are too close to be the result merely of common ideas. Lord Burghley's *Certaine precepts or directions for the well ordering of a man's life*, for instance, one of the most frequently reissued works of advice in the period, found towards the end of the century an admirer and copier in Sir Daniel Fleming: the *Advice to a Son* ascribed to Fleming is simply a transcript of Burghley. And earlier in the century the Earl of Derby (1607-51) set down a "Second Letter to his Son Charles Lord Strange,"¹ also merely a transcript of Burghley, without noting that the letter was not an original composition. Though these two instances of copying have already been noted,² some others have apparently not.

Francis Osborne's *Advice to a Son* (1656) created much more of stir than did Burghley's *Precepts*.³ Despite its popularity, however there was an attempt in 1659 to pass off *The Last Advice of Mr. Ben. Alexander . . . To His Children* as an original work.⁴ It consists of two parts. In the second, "Containing Generall And

¹ In Chetham Soc., *Remains*, LXX, 42-47.

² The first by W. Sloane, "Sir Daniel Fleming's Plagiarism of Lord Burghley," *PQ.*, XIII (1934), 302-4; the second by Paul V. Jones, *The Household of a Tudor Nobleman* (Urbana, 1917), p. 24. Cf. also V. B. Heltzel in *Hunt. Lib. Bull.*, April, 1937, p. 59, on the muddle created by attributing to an Earl of Bedford the *Advice to his Son* by Richard, Earl of Carberry.

³ Cf. the *Advice to a Son*, ed. E. A. Parry, London, 1896, Introduction; S. A. E. Betz, "A Study of Francis Osborne's 'Advice to a Son,'" in *Seventeenth Century Studies: Second Series*, ed. Robert Shafer, Princeton, 1937; and John E. Mason, *Gentlefolk in the Making* (Philadelphia, 1935), pp. 75, 76, 81, 104, 159, and 175.

⁴ The title-page describes the author as "Late Minister of West-Markham," Nottinghamshire. A Benjamin Alexander was admitted a pensioner of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, at Easter term, 1635, and received his B. A. in 1638-9. (Cf. *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees, 1544-1659*, compiled by J. and J. A. Venn, Cambridge, 1913.)

Particular Advice, Touching Religion, Opinion, Morality, Government, Study, Marriage," the precepts are all merely diluted versions of those in Osborne, except in the section on marriage. There Alexander shies away from the cynical misogyny which was a partial cause of the furore created by Osborne's work, and contents himself with seven small and very general precepts. Otherwise every idea and most of the phrasing, though somewhat watered, come from Osborne. Even the minister of West Markham's comments on religion come from Osborne, in spite of the fact that the godly ministers had previously tried to suppress the *Advice to a Son* by laying charges before the Oxford authorities that the religious teachings in the book tended to atheism.

Another and a more obvious case of borrowing from Osborne appears in the *Twenty Precepts, Or, Rules of Advice to a Son: By a late Eminent Lawyer* (1682), a single sheet printed on both sides.⁵ This is a patchwork of sentences taken bodily from Osborne, the wording practically identical. Each of the twenty precepts comprises one, two, or three admonitions from various sections of Osborne's book.⁶

More serious than these borrowings from Osborne and Burghley, however, has been the inaccurate attribution of the *Advice To a Young Lord, Written by his Father* (1691) to Thomas, fifth Baron Fairfax.⁷ For the work is clearly a condensation with slight re-

⁵ Copies in Brit. Mus. and Bodleian. David Ogg, in his *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford, 1934), II, 705, cites and summarizes these twenty precepts without apparently knowing that they are really Osborne's, produced nearly thirty years before.

⁶ Most of the precepts (Nos. 1-6, 17, and 18) are taken from Osborne's first chapter, on study. Almost as many (Nos. 9-14 and 16) are from his fourth chapter, on government. Precepts 7 and 19 are from Osborne's second chapter, on marriage. Precepts 15 and 20 are from his fifth chapter, on religion. And precept 8 is from his third chapter, on travel.

⁷ Edward Arber lists the *Advice To a Young Lord* in the *Term Catalogues* (II, 385), in the title-index to which (II, 610) he gives the author's name as T. Fairfax. Halkett and Laing, in the *Dict. of Anon. and Pseudon. Lit.*, attribute the *Advice* to Fairfax and cite Arber, II, 610. The *Advice* is entered in the revised British Museum catalogue under its title, and the supposed author's name, Thomas Fairfax, 5th Baron Fairfax, is supplied in brackets along with a cautionary question-mark. The book is listed, along with Fairfax's name and a question-mark in parentheses, in Gertrude E. Noyes' *Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seventeenth-*

visions of the *Instructions to a Son* (printed at Edinburgh, and reprinted at London for D. Trench, 1661), written by Archibald Campbell, first Marquis of Argyle. R. Baldwin, the publisher of the *Advice To a Young Lord* in 1691, also published a 1689 edition of Argyle's *Instructions*. All the references that had been made in the *Instructions* to Scotland, to the fallen glory of the Campbells, and to Argyle's own fate, are deleted from the *Advice To a Young Lord*. Each time the *Instructions* speak of the Kirk, the *Advice* refers to the Church. Aside from those changes, Argyle's 2nd chapter is the same as the *Advice*, chapter 4 ("Of Marriage"); his 3rd chapter the same as the *Advice*, chapter 6 ("Of the Court"); his 4th the same as chapter 7 ("Of Friendship"); his 5th the same as chapter 3 ("Of Travel") his 8th the same as chapter 2 ("Of Study and Exercise"); and his 9th the same as chapter 8 ("Of Pleasure and Idleness"). Argyle's chapters "Of Tenants and other concerns of Estate" and "Considerations of Life" and the collected maxims of state are omitted from the *Advice*, the tenth chapter of which, "Of Conversation," is entirely new. The fifth chapter in the *Advice*, "Of House-keeping and Hospitality," which parallels Argyle's sixth chapter, slightly expands Argyle's denunciation of drunkenness. The first chapter in the *Advice*, like that in Argyle, concerns religion, but of necessity the two differ considerably; yet the *Advice* still retains some turns of phrase from Argyle, occasionally a whole sentence, sometimes even a whole paragraph. Despite the changes which have been made, however, the *Advice To a Young Lord* remains essentially and definitely the work of Argyle. There is no good reason why it should be attributed to the fifth Lord Fairfax.

WILLIAM SLOANE

Hamilton College

"HOBGOBLIN RUNNE AWAY WITH THE GARLAND FROM APOLLO"

For some time now, Spenserian scholars have been studying the place of Arthurian legend in Elizabethan literature. The conclu-

Century England, New Haven, 1937. The *Advice*, as far as I know, was always published anonymously.

sions at which they have arrived, and which are now generally accepted, may be summarized briefly:¹

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Polydore Vergil attacked the historical authenticity of the Arthurian epic. His challenge was taken up by native English antiquarians, who sought to prove not only the truth of the Arthurian story but also the right of the Tudor family to claim direct descent, both physical and spiritual, from Arthur. For the men of the later sixteenth century, therefore, the legend of Arthur became a vehicle of nationalist and patriotic emotions; and Elizabeth herself was regarded as a kind of reincarnation of her distant ancestor. Spenser, by making Arthur the central figure of *The Faerie Queene*, was appealing to nationalist rather than romantic sentiments in his readers.

Such, in essence, are the views which are now held; and it must be admitted that they are persuasive and well buttressed by evidence. We cannot, however, accept these views uncritically. If it is true that for some men of the sixteenth century the Arthurian legends were a great patriotic epic, it is none the less true that for other men of the same period they were superstitious and dangerous fables.

We are all acquainted with Gabriel Harvey's famous characterization of *The Faerie Queene* as "*Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo.*"² This remark has been universally taken as an indication of Harvey's temperamental inability to respond to romantic poetry. In fact, many critics have taken it as a sign of Harvey's lack of any poetic taste. Even his most sympathetic editor has been compelled to say of him:

What failed him was that play of mind which can delight in dreams and shadows and music—what we call pure imagination; and there is no greater example of it than his faint praise of the *Faery Queene* in this letter.³

It is possible, however, that Harvey was not referring to the poetry of Spenser's masterpiece, but to its general plan and its intended use of certain material; and that by *Hobgoblin* he meant

¹ For an extended treatment of the thesis here summarized, see Edwin Greenlaw's *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (Baltimore, 1932), and Charles Bowie Millican's *Spenser and the Table Round* (Cambridge, 1932).

² In his *Three Proper and Wittie Familiar Letters*, 1580. See *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Smith and de Selincourt (London, 1924), p. 628.

³ G. C. Moore Smith, ed., *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 31.

barbaric and irrational legend. This possibility becomes a distinct probability when we study a treatise by John Harvey, brother of Gabriel, which was published in 1588. *A Discursive Probleme*⁴ is a work of the first importance for the critic of Spenser; but it has been almost completely neglected up to now.⁵

The book is a blistering attack upon the literary underworld of prophetic writings and ballads. Harvey clearly regards such works as harmful to true morality and religion, and incitements to sedition; and of all the false, cosening tales which he attacks, none are more bitterly criticized than those associated with the figure of Arthur. The principal heroes of the new philosophy and the new science are invoked by Harvey against the coiners of prophecies; for he regards himself as the defender of rationalism, and the attack upon prophetic writings as the attack upon superstition and ignorance.

The best way to indicate the importance of *A Discursive Probleme* is by a series of direct quotations from the text. They are given without commentary, for they need none:

1. [Dedication to Sir Christopher Hatton:]

No man either knoweth better, or can deeplier consider, than your Lordship, how notoriously and perilously the world hath continually from time to time beene abused, and in sort cosened with supposed prophesies, and counterfet soothsayings, devised either for unknowen, or for ungracious and lewd causes: intending at least Comicall sturs, but commonly fostering tragicall commotions. Not onely forraine histories, both old and new, in all languages, as well learned, as vulgar: but also our owne British and English Chronicles (as your Lordship best remembreth.)⁶

2. Nay, is any devise easier, or any practise readier, than to forge a blinde prophesie, or to coine a counterfet tale . . . or finally, to revive somme forlorne Merlin, or Pierce Plowman, or Nostradame, or the like supposed prophet? Alas, is this wise world so simple, to beleeve so foolish toyes, devised to mocke apes, and delude children?⁷

⁴ A/ DISCOURSIVE PRO-/BLEME concer-/ning Prophesies,/ How far they are to be valued, or credi-/ted, according to the surest rules and/ directions in Divinitie, Philoso-/phie, Astrologie, and other/learning:/ . . . By I. H. Physition./ Printed at London, by John/ Jackson, for Richard/ Watkins./ 1588.

⁵ It is quoted in a footnote in Dr. Mary Parmenter's article, "Spenser Twelve Aeglogues Proportionable to the Twelve Monethes," *ELH*, III (1936), 197.

⁶ *A Discursive Probleme*, sig. A4r.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2 (B1r).

3. Lift up your eies, and looke into the Divinitie Schooles: were Saint Augustine, S. Ierom, S. Ambrose, S. Gregorie, or any notable Divine, either ancient or moderne, coiners or fosterers of propheties? Descend to the Mathematicall Schooles, heare you any such matter from the mouthes of Ptolomie, Copernicus, Rheniholdus, Iofrancus, Offusius, or any singular Mathematician? Proceede to the Philosophicall chaire: and will Aristotle, Plinie, Cardane, Scalliger, Ramus or any excellent philosopher, busy your brains with any such raving, and senselesse conceits?⁸

4. My selfe have as well purposely, as incidently run over many propheties fathered upon Merlin, yea, more, I dare say, than ever that counterfet wrot, some in verse, othersome in prose; some in latin, othersome in english: some written, some imprinted: some in common letters, othersome in new founde Alphabets, and mysticall characters.⁹

5. For what a Godname can we thinke of [this prophetic writer's] other covenous, and sophisticall devises, or rather diabolicall practises; wherewith he, or the divel in him, deluded and beguiled the simpler sort. . . . Or what reckoning is indeede to be made of his Irish Lions, hideous wolues, despituous Antilops, griphins, buls, beares, foxes, moldwarps, swans, bussards, cranes, cocks, owles, and other fierce or tame creatures; are they not meere gewgawes to delight children, and very toyish cranks to mocke Apes?¹⁰

6. Everie age, every country, and every toong, howsoever barbarous, or civill, affordeth ynough, and ynough examples both of the learneded, and unlearneder stampe: but of what better credit, or more value, than the tales of Robin hood, or the fables of Robin goodfellow & the Fairies, or the woonderous acts of Howleglasse, or the wizardly fortune-tellings of the runnagate counterfet AEgyptians, commonly termed Gypsies?¹¹

7. Now touching the Finall why; or the generall and speciall ends thereof, were not these extravagant propheties, mostwhat invented and published to some such great holie effect as the tales of Hobgoblin, Robin Goodfellow, Hogmagog, Queene Grogorton, king Arthur, Bevis of Southhampton, Launcelot du Lake, Sir Tristram, Thomas of Lancaster, John à Gaunt, Guy of Warwike, Orlando furioso, Amadis du Gaul, Robin Hood and little John, Frier Tuck and maid Marian, with a thousand such Legendaries, in all languages; *vz.* to busie the minds of the vulgar sort, or to set their heads aworke withal, and to avert their conceits from the consideration of serious, and graver matters, by feeding their humors, and delighting their fansies with such fabulous and ludicrous toys.¹²

These excerpts from *A Discursive Probleme* are significant in many respects. They indicate the great vogue of prophetic literature in the late sixteenth century; they show that the Arthurian

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5 (B3r).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 52 (H2r).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55 (H3v-H4r).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 63 (I4r).

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69 (K2v-K3r).

legends were associated with such other folk material as the stories of Hobgoblin and Robin Goodfellow; and, most important of all, they reveal that the Puritan mind was scandalized by the nature and popularity of prophetic writings. Each one of these points calls for extended investigation and discussion. This brief note is intended only to call attention to the problems involved.¹²

Above all, this note is intended to clear the reputation of Gabriel Harvey. His phrase, "Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo," was not the utterance of a man without poetic feeling, but an acute and discerning criticism of *The Faerie Queene* from the standpoint of a classicist. If we look at Harvey as the champion of humanism against medievalism, we shall understand and perhaps approve, the essential spirit of his remarks on Spenser's work.

SIDNEY THOMAS

College of the City of New York

E. S. DALLAS IN TROLLOPE'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY*

In Anthony Trollope's *Autobiography*, that repository of valuable information on the professional problems of Victorian writers, the author severely censures connivance between writers and the critics of their work, and relates the following incident as an illustration:

Some years since, a critic of the day, a gentleman well known then in literary circles, showed me the manuscript of a book recently published, the work of a popular author. It was handsomely bound, and was a valuable and desirable possession. It had just been given to him by the author, as an acknowledgment for a laudatory review in one of the leading journals of the day. As I was expressly asked whether I did not regard such a token as a sign of grace both in the giver and the receiver, I said that I thought that it should neither have been given nor have been taken. My theory was repudiated with scorn, and I was told that I was strait-laced, visionary and impracticable! In all that the damage did not lie in the fact of that one present, but in the feeling on the part of the critic that his office was not debased by the acceptance of presents from those whom he criticized.¹

¹² I intend to treat these problems in a forthcoming paper.

¹ *Autobiography of Anthony Trollope* (New York, 1883), 202. All references are to this edition of the *Autobiography*.

The "critic of the day" seems to have been E. S. Dallas,² the "popular author" Charles Dickens, and the present the manuscript of *Our Mutual Friend*. The story was told by Kate Field as early as 1874, and has been repeated in more recent years:

If I remember rightly, when "Our Mutual Friend" first appeared, E. S. Dallas, a brilliant journalist, wrote an appreciative review of it for "The London Times," which largely increased the sale of the book, and fully established its success . . . In grateful acknowledgment of this review, Dickens presented the manuscript work to Mr. Dallas . . .³

The review was published in *The Times* on November 29, 1865.⁴ The autograph on the fly-leaf of the first volume of the manuscript is dated "Thursday, Fourth January, 1866."⁵

On another page of his *Autobiography*, Trollope remarks that three articles in *The Times* on his *The West Indies and the Spanish Main* "made the fortune of the book," and that "by that criticism I was much raised in my position as an author." Then he adds this comment:

² Author of *The Gay Science*, and literary reviewer for *The Times* during the eighteen-fifties and sixties.

³ "Our Mutual Friend in Manuscript," *Scribner's Monthly*, VIII (1874), 472. See also J. Holt Schooling, "Dickens's Manuscripts," *Strand Magazine*, XI (1896), 40; and Thomas Wright, *The Life of Charles Dickens* (London, 1935), 315. According to Schooling, "Shortly after Charles Dickens died, Mr. Dallas sold the manuscript, and it was bought by Mr. George W. Childs, of Philadelphia, for a large sum." The librarian of the Drexel Institute Library has informed me that Mr. Childs presented the manuscript to the Library in 1891.

⁴ The article is ascribed to Dallas in the editorial diaries of *The Times*, according to information made available to the writer through the courtesy of Sir Bruce Richmond. It was not the wholly "laudatory review" that Trollope implies. Dallas found serious faults in the novel: its beginning dragged, and Dickens' attempt at a "Social Chorus" only interrupted the story. "Mr. Veneering, and the Veneering set of people are so poor of wit and so dull of feeling that Mr. Dickens has hard work to galvanize them into something like vitality," wrote Dallas. As long as the book was not wholly condemned, the publicity of a three-column notice in *The Times* would have affected its sale. It was for the publicity, as well as for the qualified praise of the critic, that Dickens was grateful. Had he known, and had he been interested in further disqualifying the critic, Trollope might have pointed out that only a few months before the review appeared, Dickens had written to Lord Russell on behalf of Dallas' candidacy for the Chair of English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. See *The Letters of Charles Dickens* (New York, 1879), II, 275-6.

⁵ Field, *op. cit.*, p. 472.

I afterwards became acquainted with the writer of those articles, the contributor himself informing me that he had written them. I told him that he had done me a greater service than can often be done by one man to another, but that I was under no obligation to him. I do not think that he saw the matter in quite the same light.⁶

Again, the writer was Dallas, for it was he who reviewed Trollope's book in *The Times* in January, 1860.⁷ And it must have been very shortly afterwards that Trollope became acquainted with Dallas, for the latter is mentioned as among those whom Trollope met "for the first time" at a "sumptuous dinner" given by George Smith, in the same January, for contributors to the then newly founded *Cornhill Magazine*.⁸

As for the unfavorable light in which Dallas appears in these references, it should be pointed out that Trollope's memory of him was perhaps inevitably unpleasant, for it had been Dallas' misfortune to be editor of *Once a Week* when the publishers of that journal were forced to withhold *The Vicar of Bullhampton*, contrary to their contract with Trollope, in favor of a novel by Victor Hugo.⁹ It is interesting to note that, although Dallas died several years before the *Autobiography* was published, Trollope's disagreeable references to him are anonymous, but when he is mentioned by name in connection with Smith's dinner, he is "Dallas, who for a time was literary critic to *The Times*, and who certainly in that capacity did better work than has since appeared in the same department."¹⁰

Yale University

FRANCIS X. ROELLINGER

⁶ P. 103. Trollope's testimony regarding the commercial value of a favorable notice in *The Times* throws light on George Eliot's remark in a letter to her publisher in 1859: "The best news from London hitherto is that Mr. Dallas is an enthusiastic admirer of *Adam*." William Tinsley "heard it said" and could "quite believe it, that *The Times* review of the *Life of George Stephenson* was worth a good deal over a thousand pounds to Samuel Smiles." See *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals*, ed. J. W. Cross (New York, 1885), III, 64; and William Tinsley, *Random Recollections of an Old Publisher* (London, 1900), I, 129.

⁷ According to a list of Dallas' contributions, taken from the editorial diaries of *The Times*. There seem to have been two, rather than three articles, published on January 6 and 18, 1860.

⁸ *Autobiography*, p. 138.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 246-7. Again the reference to Dallas is anonymous. Mr. Michael Sadleir has given a complete account of the affair in *Trollope, A Commentary* (London, 1927), 296-8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

THE LETTERS OF RALPH WALDO EMERSON: ADDENDA

The two letters here reproduced are significant, not so much for their content, but because they form links in the chronology established by Ralph L. Rusk in his recently published edition of *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1939). Both of them are listed by Mr. Rusk but have not been published or located. The manuscripts are now in the possession of the Yale University Library.¹

In II, 384, Mr. Rusk mentions a letter:

To ———, CONCORD, MARCH 12, 1841

[MS listed in the American Autograph Shop, May, 1936;
described as referring to a letter from Carlyle.]

The text of the following letter to an unknown correspondent, who has asked Emerson for autograph material, fits this description:

Concord, 12 March, 1841.

My dear Sir

I am sorry not to find today anything to send you but a strip from Carlyle.² I have one note from Milnes,³ which I thought I could easily give your friend, but on looking at it, it is a compliment not quite becoming to send away. I have two letters from Sterling,⁴ but neither of them present

¹ The Yale University Library also owns the following unpublished notes, listed or connected with items listed by Mr. Rusk: (1) Autograph note signed, to W. S. Robinson, dated, Concord 15th July [1867?], and referring probably to Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa oration of July 18, 1867 (see Rusk, VI, 569); (2) Autograph note, to Mrs. Jean Davenport Lander, dated, Concord, Mass^{ts} 30 December [1876] (see Rusk, VI, 300). The Library is also in the possession of an autograph note signed, to an unknown correspondent, dated, Concord 16 Oct [no year], and written concerning a lecture. This note is apparently not listed by Mr. Rusk. The Forbes Library, of Northampton, Massachusetts, has an autograph note signed, to Sidney Edwin Bridgman, dated, Concord Mass 25 May 1855, and giving the price of a lecture (cf. Rusk, IV, 524).

² The enclosure is a fragment of about four hundred words, clipped from a letter written by Thomas Carlyle to Emerson. In it the four Gospels are compared to cash accounts.

³ The English poet, Richard Monckton Milnes, first Lord Houghton (1809-1885).

⁴ John Sterling (1806-1844), English author.

any detachable part to the scissors except the signature, which, I think you said, you did not want. In Carlyle's letters, of which I have a great many, I only found a single one from which an [sic] sentence could be cut away, without interfering with something on the next page. But I will bear in mind your friend's wish, & perhaps ere long I can send her another name.

Your friend & servant
R. Waldo Emerson.

In iv, 248, Mr. Rusk suggests the existence of a letter written by Emerson,

TO EMILY MERVINE DRURY, CONCORD? April c. 17? 1851

[Emily Mervine Drury, Canandaigua, N. Y., May 8 (endorsed 1851), thanked Emerson for the "kind note" she had received three (or two?) weeks since; she also mentioned a copy of the *Bhagavadgita* which he had lent her.]

This letter may now be identified as one which Emerson wrote on April 14, 1851, to his friend, Mrs. Drury,⁵ with whom he had long carried on a correspondence, and to whom he is now sending a copy of the Oriental religious book, the *Bhagavadgita*, which he had first come to know in the eighteen forties.⁶ The volume had made a decided impression upon him and in the letter he refers to it "as one of the bibles of the world," a phrase which he later incorporated into his essay on "Books."⁷ More important to him at the moment, however, is his reaction to the slavery question in his home state, for in this letter he re-expresses his feelings on a subject which occupies many pages in his *Journals*. The letter follows:

⁵ Mrs. Drury was the daughter of Captain William Mervine of the United States Navy and the wife of Leander M. Drury, United States pension agent at Canandaigua (1869). For other letters to her see Rusk, iv, *passim*; v, 25, 88-89, 190-191, 234.

⁶ He was probably familiar with the edition published under the title: *The Bhāgvāt-Gēētā, or Dialogues of Krēeshnā and Ārjōñ . . .* translated Charles Wilkins (London, 1785).

⁷ See *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Centenary ed., Boston and New York, 1903-04), vii, 218, where he writes: "I mean the Bibles of the world," and cites the *Bhagavadgita* as one of his examples. The essay, "Books," first appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for January, 1858. Emerson and Bronson Alcott talked for some years of publishing a "Bible of the Nations" or "a Bible for Mankind," which would, of course, include the *Bhagavadgita*. See *The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, ed. Odell Shepard (Boston, 1938), pp. 136-137, 180, 383, [385], 388, etc.

Concord, 14 April 1851

My dear Mrs. Drury,

I received your kind note just as I was leaving home for Pittsburgh, Pa.,⁹ quite a month ago. The Bhagavad Geeta⁹ had only a day or two earlier set forth on its travels, because my bookseller¹⁰ told me, that it could not well find a safe carrier until their "Tradesales" began. I hope it has reached you ere now: and when it comes, I confide that you will remember my rules, not to read it except in the best hours, & to read it as one of the bibles of the world. I am gratified, of course, that you find my books readable & veracious—to a degree. But you have not done what you was charged to do, I mean, to make the exceptions, & show the vices of these writings. But, at this moment, in the cruelty & the ignominy of the laws, & the shocking degradation of Massachusetts,¹¹ I have had no heart to look at books, or to think of anything else than how to retrieve this crime. All sane persons are startled by the treachery not only of the officials, but of the controlling public of the moment, in Boston. It is one sad lesson more to destroy all national pride, all reliance on others. "In ourselves our freedom must be sought."¹² But against & over all this, we must hope, & firmly assure ourselves.

Your affectionate servant,
R W Emerson

BARBARA DAMON SIMISON

New Haven, Connecticut

⁹ On March 21, 1851, Emerson began, in Pittsburgh, his series of six lectures on the subject, "Conduct of Life." See James Elliot Cabot, *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (3d ed., Boston and New York, 1888), II, 566-567, 754.

¹⁰ One of Emerson's several spellings of *Bhagavadgita*.

¹⁰ Emerson did business at the time with James Munroe & Company, 134 Washington Street, Boston. In a letter of May 14, 1851, quoted in Rusk, IV, 250, he suggests that his copy of the *Bhagavadgita* "could be left at James Munroe's."

¹¹ Early in 1851 Emerson had been disturbed by Daniel Webster's so-called treachery in supporting the Fugitive Slave Law. On May third of this year he even went so far as to denounce Webster publicly in an address at Concord.

¹² Here Emerson is doubtless misquoting, paraphrasing, or quoting an earlier version of the sixth line of Wordsworth's sonnet headed "November, 1806," which reads: "That in ourselves our safety must be sought."

PARALLELS TO SOME PASSAGES IN *PROMETHEUS
UNBOUND*

The following parallels are presented as a slight supplement to the collections in Weaver's *Toward the Understanding of Shelley* (1932), Clark's "Shelley and Shakespeare," *PMLA.*, LIV, 261-287 (1939), and Droop's *Die Belesenheit Shelley's* (1906). They may serve as fresh illustrations of Shelley's great susceptibility to the influence of other writers.¹

To me

Shall they become like *sister-antelopes*
By one fair dam, snow-white and swift as wind,
Nursed among lilies near a brimming stream. (*P. U.*, III, iii, 96-9)

Thy two breasts are like two yong *Roes*, *that are twinnes*, which feed
among the lillies. (*Song of Solomon*, IV, 5)

And Conquest is dragged captive through the deep. (*P. U.*, IV, 556)

When he ascended up on high, he led captivitie captive. (*Ephesians*, IV, 8)

In the following passage Shelley seems to have been influenced both by Homer and by Vergil.

Trampling the slant winds on high
With golden-sandalled *feet*, that glow
Under plumes of *purple dye*,
Like *rose-ensanguined ivory*,
A Shape comes now. (*P. U.*, I, 318-22)

As when some woman . . . staineth *ivory* with *purple*, . . . even in such
wise, Menelaos, were thy shapely thighs stained with *blood* and thy legs
and thy fair *ankles* beneath. (*Iliad*, IV, 141-7, trans. Lang, Leaf, Myers)

Indum *sanguineo* veluti violaverit *ostro*
si quis *ebur*, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
alba rosa: talis virgo dabat ore colores. (*Aeneid*, XII, 67-9)

I know ye; and these lakes and echoes know
The darkness and the *clangour* of your *wings*. (*P. U.*, I, 459-60)

Harpyiae et magnis quatiunt *clangoribus alas*. (*Aeneid*, III, 226)²

¹ Cf. Pottle, *Shelley and Browning* (1923), p. 34, n. 1. That Shelley himself was aware of this susceptibility is implied in his Preface to *The Cenci*, footnote 2. See also the Preface to *P. U.*, the third paragraph from the end.

² Nitchie (*Vergil and the English Poets*, 1919, p. 198, n. 2) has noted in *P. U.*, II, ii, 90-93 an allusion to Vergil, *Eclogue vi*, 31-42.

SOME PASSAGES IN *PROMETHEUS UNBOUND* 429

And new fire
From earthquake-rifted mountains of bright snow
Shook its portentous hair beneath Heaven's frown. (*P. U.*, I, 166-8)

Viden ut faces
Splendidas quatunt comas? (Catullus, LXI, 77-8 [cf. 94-5])³

And Youth's smooth ocean, smiling to betray (*P. U.*, II, v, 100)

suggests Horace's metaphorical use of the ocean in his Ode to Pyrrha (I, v, 5-12).

Pity the self-despising slaves of Heaven,
Not me, *within whose mind* sits peace serene,
As light in the sun, *throned*. (*P. U.*, I, 429-31)⁴

But mercy is above this sceptred sway;
It is *enthroned in the hearts* of kings. (*Merchant of Venice*, IV, i, 192-3)

For men were slowly *killed by frowns* and smiles. (*P. U.*, I, 590)

On whom, as in despite, the sun looks pale,
Killing their fruit with *frowns*. (*K. Henry V*, III, v, 17-18)

Who made that sense which, when *the winds* of spring
In rarest visitation, . . . (*P. U.*, II, iv, 12-13)

And *in the visitation of the winds*. (*K. Henry IV*, Part 2, III, i, 21)

To these examples of the influence of earlier writers upon Shelley,
I would add one of the influence of Shelley upon Browning:

Where the wild-bee never flew (*P. U.*, II, i, 180).

Where the swallow never flew. (*Pippa Passes*, Introd., fin.)

ALICE F. BRAUNLICH

Goucher College

³ Duckett (*Catullus in English Poetry*, Smith College Classical Studies, VI, 1925, p. 105) has pointed out that "To Constantia Singing" shows the influence of Catullus, LI, which is a translation from Sappho.

⁴ As Scudder has observed (ed. *P. U.*, p. 135), this passage is similar in thought, though not in form, to Aesch., *Prom. Bound*, 966-7.

EVIDENCE FOR DEFOE'S AUTHORSHIP OF *THE*
MEMOIRS OF CAPTAIN CARLETON

Although *The Memoirs of Captain Carleton* has been assigned to Defoe at intervals for more than a century,¹ many scholars still question its authorship (chiefly for reasons of style and literary method, such as the relative absence of the characteristic anecdotes which abound in Defoe's representative writings). All the principal biographers of Defoe have cast some doubt on the authorship of this narrative; even so recent and able a study as Professor James Sutherland's concedes no more than that the *Memoirs* has been "frequently, but not quite conclusively, attributed to Defoe."²

In the second volume of *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1725), Defoe had made the following observation in his account of Yorkshire:

The River *Wharfe* seemed very small, and the Water low, at *Harwood* Bridge, so that I was surprised to see so fine a Bridge over it, and was thinking of the great Bridge at *Madrid* over the *Mansanares*, of which a *Frenchman* of Quality looking upon it, said to the *Spaniards* that were about him, *That the King of Spain ought either to buy them some Water, or they should sell their Bridge.*³

In the third volume of the same work (1726 or 1727—the date is controversial) Defoe had repeated the anecdote in his account of the bridge over the Clyde at Glasgow:

As for the Bridge, which is a lofty, stately Fabrick; it stood out of the Water as naked as a Skeleton, and look'd somewhat like the Bridge over the *Mansanares*, near Madrid, which I mention'd once before; of which a *French* Ambassador told the People the King should either buy them a River, or sell their Bridge.⁴

A year or two later we find that the author of *The Memoirs of Captain Carleton* (1728) used the anecdote even more appropriately with reference to the original river at Madrid:

. . . tho' they have what they call a River, to which they give the very fair Name of *la Mansuera*, and over which they have built a curious, long,

¹ Cf. A. W. Secord, *Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, ix, Urbana, 1924).

² *Defoe* (London, 1937), p. 268.

³ G. D. H. Cole ed. (London, 1927), II, 618.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 743.

and large Stone Bridge; yet is the Course of it, in Summer time especially, mostly dry. This gave occasion to that piece of Raillery of a Foreign Ambassador, *That the King would have done wisely to have bought a River, before he built the Bridge.*⁵

If the *Memoirs* had appeared first, we would be tempted to assume that Defoe had borrowed this picturesque anecdote when he came to write his *Tour*. Instead, we find him remembering it, and using it fluently, two times *before it appeared in its proper context with reference to the bridge near Madrid*. Furthermore, Defoe's *Tour* was a work on a very different subject—one which would not conceivably have been consulted by the almost legendary old soldier Carleton, even if he were otherwise capable of preparing his supposed reminiscences of the war in Spain.

When William Lee declared that he saw no evidence for Defoe's authorship of the *Memoirs* ("I can find none, external or internal")⁶ he had certainly overlooked this highly characteristic anecdote.

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

Indiana University

THREE IMITATIONS OF SPENSER

To be added to the list of eighteenth-century sonnets using the Spenserian rhyme scheme is an anonymous one in *The Shamrock: or, Hibernian Cresses* (Dublin, 1772). The author of the sonnet was Samuel Whyte, editor of *The Shamrock* and probably author of a considerable part of its contents, but remembered now only as a teacher of Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Thomas Moore. In Whyte's *Poems on Various Subjects* (1792; third edition, Dublin, 1795), the sonnet and a few other of Whyte's contributions to *The Shamrock* are reprinted, but there is nothing else of Spenserian interest. The sonnet, "To Mr. Thomas Hickey, with Spenser's Fairy Queen," which tells the portrait painter, Hickey, that he should attempt to blend "The Painter's magick Skill, and Poet's Fire," is interesting for its opening reference to Spenser:

⁵ First ed. (London, 1728), p. 305.

⁶ *Daniel Defoe: His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings* (London, 1869), I, 439.

HICKEY, whose faithful Pencil Nature guides,
 Attend the immortal Strains, sweet SPENSER sings,
 Whilst on his fiery *Pegasus* he rides,
 And steers his easy flight with rapid Wings.

The Shamrock, a volume which has an imposing list of twelve or thirteen hundred subscribers; is a collection of anonymous poetry to which, says Whyte's son, Bell, Pearch, and *The New Foundling Hospital for Wit* were frequently indebted. It has on its title page a motto from Spenser's *Veue*, and contains two Spenserian imitations not noticed by Professor Phelps and others who have written about such imitations: "The Temple of Glory, Inscribed to the Meritorious" (28 regular Spenserian stanzas), and "Irene: A Canto, On the Peace" (49 regular Spenserian stanzas). There is also an imitation of an imitation, an irregular poem frankly modelled upon and indebted to Bishop Lowth's Spenserian attempt, "The Choice of Hercules," and bearing the same title.

J. N. Hook

University of Illinois

COLERIDGE'S "METRICAL EXPERIMENTS"

In 1912 Ernest Hartley Coleridge published as original poems the eleven "Metrical Experiments" that he found in one of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's manuscripts.¹ The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century-like character of the themes, metre, and diction, however, and S. T. C's. frequent practice of copying into his notebooks poems by earlier writers without indicating their authorship, as in his many quotations from William Cartwright,² may well cause one to suspect their originality. At least two of the "Metrical Experiments" are not by Coleridge. "Songs of Shepherds and rustical Roundelays" is a popular seventeenth-century song that is to be found in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript, *Westminster Drollery* (1672), *Wit and Drollery* (1682), Dryden's Miscellany (1716 and 1727), and later in Ritson's *Select Collection of English Songs*

¹ *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Oxford, 1912), 1014-19.

² See *ibid.*, 996 n.

(1785), where Coleridge might well have discovered it. "When thy Beauty appears," which Coleridge called "An Experiment for a Metre," is the first stanza of a poem by Thomas Parnell. Such evidence necessarily throws doubt on Coleridge's authorship of any of the "Metrical Experiments" except the first and probably the three headed "Nonsense Verses." It is an interesting comment on Parnell that Professor Saintsbury, believing his poem to be by Coleridge, wrote of it: "Very like some late seventeenth-century (Dryden time) motives and a *leetle* 'Moorish.'"³

EARL R. WASSERMAN

University of Illinois

VIER BRIEFE AUS GLEIMS FREUNDESKREISE

Die folgenden Briefe von Gleim, Zimmermann und Ramler sind ungedruckt, soviel ich aus den mir zugänglichen Hilfsquellen feststellen kann. Die Originalhandschriften, deren Text hier genau wiedergegeben wird, befinden sich in meinem Besitz.

1. Gleim an Heinrich Christian Boie.¹

Halberstadt den 19ten Dec. 1769

Wenn Sie keine Lust haben, mein liebster Herr Boie, zu Berlin² zu bleiben, und ich wünschte, beynahe, unpatriotisch genug,³ daß sie diese Lust nicht hätten, wovon ich jedoch die Ursachen Ihnen hier nicht vorerzählen kan, so kommen Sie geschwind wieder zu uns zurück, nach dem kleinen Halberstadt, und bleiben Sie, so lang' es Ihnen gefällt. Jacobi⁴ komt bald wieder, mit Lichtwehr⁵ mach ich sie bekant, und Gleim ist ihr

² *Ibid.*, 1020.

¹ Doppelblatt in Oktav, nur mit einem Teil des Wasserzeichens, einer Krone. Am Kopf des Blattes die nachträgliche Bemerkung: *wäre[?] zu lassen.*

² In Begleitung seines Zöglings, des jungen Herrn von der Lühe, war Boie am 21. Dezember 1769 in Berlin angekommen: vgl. Karl Weinhold, *Heinrich Christian Boie*, Halle, 1868, S. 25.

³ Die Worte: *beynahe, unpatriotisch genug*, als Nachtrag am Rande und über der Zeile.

⁴ J. G. Jacobi hatte 1768 eine Präbende am Stifte St. Mauritii und Bonifacii in Halberstadt erhalten.

⁵ M. G. Lichtwer war seit 1752 Regierungsrat in Halberstadt.

aufrichtiger Freund, was wollen Sie mehr? Wenigstens wünscht ich, daß Sie mit Annehmung irgend einer Stelle sich nicht übereilen, sondern vorher erst beschließen, welche Laufbahn des Glücks sie wählen oder vielmehr welche Art des Lebens von meistem Wehrt auf die längste Zeit in Ihren Augen haben möchte. Unsere Zeit wollen wir hier schon nützlich und angenehm zubringen. Jacobi, der Herausgeber meiner Sächelchen,⁶ würde gern sehen, wenn sie bey diesem Geschäftchen ihm helfen wollten! Jacobi will gern selbst eine Sammlung seiner Werke⁷ gegen Ostern machen, hätten wir Zeit übrig wir wolten sie gemeinschaftlich nicht unnütze für die Musen verwenden.

Halberst. den 24ten Dec. 1769

Dies Briefchen, mein wehrtester Herr Boie, sollte auf Ihrer Berlinischen Reise sie einholen, wo nicht ihnen zu vorkommen! Denn es fiel das schlechteste Wetter ein; ich dachte, sie würden zu Magdeburg Ruhetage nöthig gefunden haben; mir war bange für sie, und für ihren jungen Herren, sehr bange war mir. In solchem Wetter? und, auf ofnem Postwagen? Der arme Herr Boie! der arme Herr von der Lühe! Warum nahmen Sie auch im Winter nicht einen zugemachten Wagen? Warum verwahrten sie sich nicht mit Pelzen? Warum sollte der Mentor des Herren von der Lühe mit seinem Telemach um kommen? So dachten, so redten wir von ihnen! Gottlob, daß sie nicht umgekommen, daß sie glücklich angekommen sind! Ein Beweis ihrer Freundschaft, lieber Herr Boie, war es, daß Sie mir bald Nachricht gaben! Denn in Wahrheit ich war Ihrentwegen in großen Sorgen! mehr vielleicht, als ich Ursache hatte, denn Sie sind noch ein junger Hercules; Wind und Wetter ist ihnen nicht so fürchterlich, nicht ihrer Gesundheit so gefährlich, als mir abgelebtem Greiß! Auch für die Nachricht von den ersten ruhigen Stunden dank ich ihnen. Ich freue mich, wenn ich höre, daß es meinem Boie wohlgeht! Herr von der Lühe hätte mir freylich weit mehr gefallen, und vielleicht ich ihm etwas mehr, wenn ich nicht gewußt hätte, daß er mit seinem Mentor, und dieser mit ihm, nicht zufrieden sey.⁸ Nicht ohne Vorsatz sagt ich ihm, daß er sich glücklich schätzen müste, von einem Boie, Weisheit und Tugend zu lernen. Ich beklag ihn, wenn er nicht umkehrt, und sie nicht bittet, sein Mentor zu bleiben. Empfehlen Sie mich ihm bestens, und, wenn er umkehrt, so sagen sie ihm, daß ich ihn liebe; wie man einen Herkules liebt, der die Wahl vollendet hat.

O, mein lieber Herr Boie, senden sie mir doch ja mit der ersten Post, unsers großen Mendelssohns⁹ kleine Schrift an Lavater! Mich verlangt

⁶ Vielleicht Anspielung auf die *Sinngedichte*, Berlin 1769: vgl. *Almanach der deutschen Musen*, 1770, S. 112.

⁷ Johann Georg Jacobis *Sämmtliche Werke*, Erster, Zweyter Theil, erschienen 1770 bei Gros in Halberstadt: vgl. *Almanach der deutschen Musen*, 1771, S. 65-67.

⁸ Vgl. Weinhold, *Boie*, S. 23 ff.

⁹ Mendelssohns *Schreiben an den Herrn Diaconus Lavater zu Zürich*, 32 Seiten, Berlin und Stettin, trägt zwar das Datum 1770, muß aber schon

sehr darnach, und ich bin krank, ich schreib ihnen auf dem Bette! Sagen Sie dem großen Lambert,¹⁰ daß der ein H. ist, der da behauptet, daß ich in der Apologie für Amor¹¹ seiner gespottet¹² habe, sagen sie dem großen Mendelssohn¹³ daß der unmöglich sein Freund seyn kan, der mein Gedichtchen an ihn in der A. Bibl.¹⁴ so wunderbar ausgelegt hat, sagen Sie sich selbst, daß ich Ihr redlicher Freund bin

Gleim. *Eiligst*

Ende 1769 erschienen sein: vgl. den *Anzeiger des Teutschen Merkurs* 1784, Seite CXLi: "weil nach der Gewohnheit unsrer Buchhändler die meisten Werke die in der Michäelismesse erscheinen die folgende Jahrzahl führen."

¹⁰ Joh. Heinr. Lambert, seit 1764 in Berlin, Mitglied der dortigen Akademie, Verfasser von: *Neues Organon oder Gedanken über die Erforschung und Bezeichnung des Wahren und dessen Unterscheidung vom Irrthum und Schein*, Leipzig, 1764.

¹¹ *Apologie für Amor*: ein Gedicht dieses Titels ist mir nicht bekannt; unterm 29. Nov. 1769 (*Briefwechsel zwischen Gleim und Uz*, hrsg. von Schüddekopf, Bibl. Lit. Ver. 218, S. 390) erwähnt Gleim seine *Schutzschrift für Amor*: Schüddekopf (S. 515) bezieht dies auf Gleims Gedicht "An den Herrn Canonicus Jacobi, als ein Criticus wünschte, daß er aus seinen Gedichten den Amor herauslassen möchte. Zu Berlin im May 1769" (vgl. Goedeke iv. 1. 86, 38). Die Original-Ausgabe dieses Gedichts ist mir unzugänglich, es wurde jedoch im *Almanach der deutschen Musen. auf das Jahr 1770*. Leipzig, S. 175-182 wieder abgedruckt. Eine Stelle, die auf einen Gelehrten wie Lambert gedeutet werden könnte, lautet (S. 175 f.):

Was that, o Freund, dem weisen Mann,
Dem kleinen Meister Lobesan;
Der alle Stern am Himmel zählen,
Und in den Sternen alle Seelen,
Und Sonnenstäubchen spalten kann;
Was that dem Feinde meiner Nymphen,

Was that dem Mann dein Amor doch?
Mit Zirkel, Winkelmaas, und Spott
Verfolgt er immer, immer noch,
Den schönen, kleinen, guten Gott!
Noch immer seh ich seine Seele
Voll Groll; in seiner Timonshöle
Laurt er auf ihn! Sein Auge glüht,
Wie eines Mörders, der den Degen
Mit Vorsatz, einen zu erlegen,
Auf Bruder und auf Vater zieht.

¹² Anstatt seiner *gespottet* stand ursprünglich: *ihn verspottet*.

¹³ Boie besuchte Mendelssohn bald nach seiner Ankunft: vgl. Weinhold, *Boie*, S. 26.

¹⁴ Gemeint ist, wohl Nicolais *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*: die betreffende Stelle habe ich jedoch nicht gefunden.

Nachtrag am Rande der zweiten Seite:

Vergessen sie doch ja nicht den ehrlichen Herrn Grillo¹⁵ zu besuchen! und die gute Frau Karschin.¹⁶ Ich bin bey beyden in großer Briefschuld!

Nachtrag am Rande der dritten Seite:

Machen Sie mir doch ja keine Entschuldigungen wegen des *Eilfertigen Briefschreibens*. Ich darf sonst ihnen nie wieder schreiben.

2. Johann Georg Zimmermann an Gleim.¹⁷

Hannover 27. Dec. 1774

Der Überbringer dieses Briefes, mein theurester und hochzuverehrender Herr Canonicus, ist ein junger rechtschafner Mann, Herr *Ziegler*¹⁸ aus Hannover, der in der Absicht reiset, um seine allbereit sehr beträchtliche Kenntnisse der Naturgeschichte, der Mineralogie, der Landoeconomie, der Mechanik, der Baukunst, und *aller schönen Künste* zu vermehren. Reisende dieser Art verdienen Unterstützung wo Sie hinkommen, und diese darf ich mir für Halberstadt von meinem Gleim ausbitten, der gewiß kein größeres Vergnügen in der Welt kennet als jungen Männern von Talenten aufzuhelfen. Mir deucht Herr Ziegler sollte für den Herrn Domdechant von Spiegel¹⁹ und den Herrn Domherrn von Rochow,²⁰ allenfalls auch wenn unser theure Herr Graf von Stolberg in Halberstadt wäre, ein sehr angenehmer und sehr präsentabler Mann seyn, so wie er auch diese Herren zu seinem Zwecke sehr nützen könnte.

Meinen Brief vom 7. Decemb. werden Sie erhalten haben, und nach der Antwort sehne ich mich sehr?—Noch muß ich zu diesem Briefe hinzusetzen,

¹⁵ Friedrich Grillo war Professor am Kadettenkorps in Berlin; vgl. Weinhold, *Boie*, S. 29.

¹⁶ Die Karschin hat Boie mehrmals besucht; vgl. Weinhold, *Boie*, S. 29. 31.

¹⁷ Doppelblatt in Großquart; die letzte Seite ist weiß; Wasserzeichen mit dem Namen *D & C Blauw*.

¹⁸ Vermutlich Christian Ludewig Ziegler, geboren am 5. November 1748, von Meusel (*Gelehrtes Teutschland*, 5. Ausg. Lemgo 1800, VIII, 688) als kurhannöverscher Baumeister und Verfasser von Schriften über die Baukunst usw. angeführt.

¹⁹ Unterm 15. Dez. 1776 erwähnt Goecking einen Kammerherrn Freiherr von Spiegel in Halberstadt; unterm 30. März 1780 wird er Domdechant genannt (Strodtmann, *Briefe von und an Bürger*, I, 379; III, 11); Gleim hat drei Gedichte an Spiegel gerichtet (Goedeke IV. 1. 87, 66, 67; 88, 74).

²⁰ Gemeint ist Friedrich Eberhard von Rochow, geboren 1734, Erbherr auf Rekahn, Prälat zu U. L. F. und Domherr zu Halberstadt (Meusel, *Gelehrtes Teutschland* VI, 389 ff.; vgl. Goedeke IV. 1. 511, 17).

daß ich anitzt die Lyrische Blumenlese²¹ und die Vorrede²² (die Ihnen so schmerzhaft gewesene Vorrede) gelesen aber nicht verstanden habe. Das Unternehmen des Herrn Rammlers andern Dichtern, auch gegen ihren Willen, ihre Schriften nach seinem Sinne abgeändert herauszugeben, ist so seltsam, um mich des gelindesten Wortes zu bedienen, daß man sich über daher entstandene Streitigkeiten bey dem *genere irritabili vatum*²³ nicht zu verwundern hat. In wie fern Sie nun, mein theurester Gleim, in diese Streitigkeiten verwickelt sind, oder diesen oder jenen Stich in der Vorrede vielleicht sich zuziehen da ganz andere Dichter dabey gemeint seyn können, dies bin ich nicht im Stande zu beurtheilen. Aber das können Sie versichert seyn, daß mich alles schmerzt, was Ihnen, lieber trauter Freund, wehe thut.

Mir deucht ich habe vergessen Ihnen zu sagen wie sehr sich Sultzer der Freude gefreuet hat, die Sie mir letzten Herbst in ihrem Hause, auf dem Wege nach Wernigerode, und so lange wir daselbst beysammen waren, gemacht haben.

Herder hat ihrer in einem neulichen Briefe an mich überaus freundschaftlich und liebevoll gedacht.

Tausend hertzliche Grüße an die Hälfte ihres Lebens, die liebe und mir unvergeßliche Mademoiselle Gleim. Noch ist mir das Andenken ihres Hauses so werth und lebhaft, daß ich alles was darinn lebet und Athem hohlet, (sogar jede Katze, wenn jemand den Auftrag übernehmen wollte) möchte küssen lassen.

²¹ *Lyrische Blumenlese*, Leipzig, bey Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1774. Der Band enthält die Bücher I-V, denen im Jahre 1778 die Bücher VI-IX folgten; vgl. unten den Brief Ramlers an Reich.

²² Der Vorbericht von 14 Seiten ist datiert vom 24. September 1774. Ramler gesteht, daß er eigenmächtige Änderungen in den in die Sammlung aufgenommenen Gedichten gemacht habe: "Ob man einzelne Verse, Halbverse und Wörter dem ersten oder dem zweyten Herausgeber [d. h. Ramler] zuzuschreiben hat, ist eigentlich eine sehr gleichgültige Sache . . . Fehler aufzusuchen ist für einen Liebhaber der Dichtkunst nicht die angenehmste Beschäftigung . . . Man hat seinen Zeitgenossen und Freunden gern einen andern Dienst leisten wollen: man hat ihre Werke in der Absicht durchgelesen, um ihre Schönheiten zu entdecken, und diejenigen Stücke, die uns am schönsten zu seyn schienen, zur Ehre unsres Landes zu sammeln. Hiebey war es aber um so viel nöthiger, nach unserm Vermögen, einige zurückgebliebene Flecken hinwegzunehmen: weil die fehlerhaften Stücke nirgends sichtbarer hervorstechen, als wann sie neben solchen gesehen werden, die frey von dergleichen Fehlern sind. Man hätte diese Sorge den Verfassern selbst überlassen können. Viele derselben wußten es sehr wohl, daß einigen ihrer Stücke noch die letzte Feile mangelte. Allein sie hatten andre, zum Theil wichtigere Sachen, auszuarbeiten" (Vorbericht S. v-ix); welche Stelle im Vorbericht Gleim besonders anstößig war, ist nicht festzustellen; über Gleims Zwist mit Ramler vgl. Goedeke iv. 1. 183, 68.

²³ *genere irritabili vatum*: vgl. Horaz Epist. II. 2. 102.

Hertzlich werde ich mich freuen, wenn ich in das Meer von Vergnügen, mit dem ich Sie, lieber Gleim, umgeben wünsche, von Zeit zu Zeit auch nur ein Tröpfchen tragen kann.

J. G. Zimmermann.

Meine beste Empfehlung an
Herrn Jacobi.

3. K. W. Ramler an Ph. E. Reich.²⁴

Liebster, bester Freund,

Hier empfangen Sie Ihren Engländer, zu dem ich Ihnen keinen *würdigen* Dolmetscher habe aufreiben und — antreiben können. — Sie sollten mehr empfangen, wenn mein alter Professor Ebert²⁵ mir nicht statt aller Bücher und Schreibereyn wäre. Nach acht Tagen werde ich ihn nicht mehr sehen, und denn wird es auf die *beiden letzten* neuen Stücke zu dem 2ten Theil der lyrischen Blumenlese losgehen, die ich *Lyrische Blumenlese*²⁶ VI. VII. VIII. IX. *Buch* benennen werde, damit die *Zahl der Musen* voll werde, die ich nicht überschreiten will. Da dieses nur vier Bücher seyn werden, so gebrauchen wir der Vignetten zwey weniger, als das vorige mal. Als denn sind keine Lieder der Deutschen²⁷ mehr. Die 57 schlechtesten Stücke dieser alten Sammlung sind nicht allein weggeworfen und an deren Stelle 57 neue Meisterstücke in ihrer Art gewählt worden; sondern die meisten die geblieben sind, haben so viel Verbesserungen erhalten, daß man diese Ausgabe für ein durchaus neues Werk halten kann. Es wird, wie ich sehe, 26 Bogen betragen. Für den Bogen des ersten Theils gaben sie mir 8 rth., und für den B. dieses Th. hoffe ich 5 rth. mit gutem Gewissen fordern zu können. Ich habe ein sauberes Exemplar für die Druckerey verfertigt, das *einer Dame von Stande* so wohl gefällt, daß sie mich ersucht hat, es ihr als ein Andenken von meiner Hand zu lassen, weil es das Verdienst hat, daß man die verworfenen Zeilen und Lieder zugleich ansehen kann. Ich möchte also wissen, ob man es wohl aus der Druckerey *unbeschadet* zurück erhalten kann. Sonst muß ich noch ein andres für den Setzer fertig

²⁴ Doppelblatt in Großquart, anderthalb Seiten Text; rückseitig die Adresse: *A Monsieur, Monsieur Reich, Libraire très-célèbre, à Leipzig. Hiebey ein Buch in 4 Heften.* Dazu Vermerk des Empfängers: 1777. 25. *Junius Berlin Ramler.* Wasserzeichen im Falz: Vanden Ley. Philip Erasmus Reich war Leiter der Firma Weidmanns Erben und Reich.

²⁵ Johann Arnold Ebert (1723-1795), Professor am Carolinum in Braunschweig, der aber nur zwei Jahre älter als Ramler war; vielleicht wollte Ramler schreiben: "mein alter *Freund* Professor Ebert."

²⁶ Der Band erschien unter dem Titel: *Lyrische Blumenlese.* VI. VII. VIII. IX. *Buch.* Leipzig, bey Weidmanns Erben und Reich. 1778; vgl. oben Anmerkung 21.

²⁷ *Lieder der Deutschen.* Berlin bey G. L. Winter 1766; (8 unnummerierte und 366 nummerierte Seiten).

VIER BRIEFE AUS GLEIMS FREUNDESKRIESE 439

machen, und das frühere für Ihren Corrector mit schicken.—Grüßen Sie unsern lieben Freund Weisse,²⁸ dem ich noch nicht antworten kann. Auch Herrn Dyk²⁹ bitte ich zu sagen, daß er nach acht Tagen einen Brief mit Beylagen durch Herrn Himburgs Handlung von mir erhalten wird.—Das Zweyte Werkchen³⁰ was ich ganz im *Manuscript* für Sie habe möchte wohl zur Michaelismesse noch nicht reif seyn. Ich verschweige also seinen Namen noch. Und nun wünsche ich Ihnen viele ländlichen und häuslichen Freuden, und empfehle mich Ihrem freundschaftlichen Andenken als

Ihr

ewig getreuer

Ramler

Berlin d. 21. Jun:
1777.

4. Gleim an J. H. Voß.³¹

Halberstadt den 12ten Sept. 1784.

Wie denn soll ich Ihnen danken, unsterblicher Voß, für das unendliche Vergnügen, daß Sie mit Ihren vermischten Gedichten³² mir machten diesen ganzen Sommer! Sie haben mich begleitet überall, in mein kleines Sans Soucis, auf die Gebürge des Harzes, aufs Land! — Herders Ideen,³³ u. Zimmermanns Einsamkeit, zwey göttliche Werke, stachen sie aus, zuweilen, nein! machten, daß ich nicht immer sie in Händen hatte — Göttliche Ge-

²⁸ Christian Felix Weisse.

²⁹ J. G. Dyk, Verleger; Herausgeber der Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften.

³⁰ Welches das zweite Werkchen gewesen, ist schwer zu sagen: für 1778 verzeichnet Goedeke (IV. 1. 181) nur: 37) *Cephalus und Prokris, Melodrama*, welches aber in Berlin erschien, und 38) *Kriegslieder für Josephs und Friedrichs Heere*, o. O., 4 Bl. 4°, welches kaum in Betracht käme.

³¹ Doppelblatt in klein Oktav, letzte Seite weiß; Wasserzeichen im Falz: eine Art Wappen, mit dem Buchstaben A. In der *Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte* VII, 133-136 sind zwei Briefe von Voß an Gleim, vom 24. Juni, 1784, und 28. April 1785, abgedruckt.

³² Da die rechtmäßige Ausgabe von Voßens Gedichten erst 1785 erschien, so muß Gleim die unrechtmäßige Ausgabe benutzt haben: *J. H. Voß vermischte Gedichte und prosaische Aufsätze, Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1784*. Dazu stimmt auch der Ausdruck: "Ihren vermischten Gedichten": die Ausgabe 1785 hat als Titel: *Gedichte von Johann Heinrich Voß. Erster Band, Hamburg, 1785*.

³³ Der erste Theil von Herders *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* erschien 1784 in Riga; der erste Band von J. G. Zimmermanns *Über die Einsamkeit*, erschien 1784 in Leipzig.

dichte, Voß! O! möcht' ich, möcht' ich fliegen können auf einem Luftschiff³⁴
einen Dankkuß Ihnen zu geben, nur einen! aber einen, wie Stolbergs³⁵
Kuß, als Er

Ach! auf die Einzige hin den flammenden Blick heftete!

Ganz etwas anders ist doch den ganzen Dichter zu lesen, als den zerstückelten in den Almanachen, den Blumenlesen,³⁶ den Stinktöpfen—

Dank deswegen auch dir, du Scholar in Gießen,³⁷ daß du meinen Voß gesammelt, und ihn genöthigt hast sich selbst zu sammeln!

Hier, mein bester Voß, zehn rth. in Golde für zehn Exemplare der bessern Sammlung³⁸—

Für die übrigbleibenden zehn ggr. und das Eilfte Exemplar bitt ich mir aus ein sauber gebundnes Exemplar in meine Dichter Bibliothek, die nun ein eignes hübsches Haus hat, und noch zweye für Schmidt³⁹ und Fischer,⁴⁰ die ich damit überraschen will, sie sind so gütig von selbst und schreiben ihren Nahmen in alle dreye!

Ach! mein Theurer! die unsterblichen Stolberge kommen nun wohl nicht wieder, sie haben ihr Versprechen über Halberstadt den Rückweg zu nehmen wohl nicht halten können! Tausend, und noch Tausend und eine Million Umarmungen den Unsterblichen, und ihrer Unsterblichkeit nächsten Mitgenossen—

Heiliger Baum, der oft mit Begeisterung meinen geliebten
Stolberg einsam umrauscht, oft uns vereinigte hier,
Ihn, Agnes⁴¹ und mich!

Unter diesem Baum, ihr Götter! laßt mich sitzen mit Ihnen und der
Voßin,⁴² eh ich hingehe zu Pyra, Kleist, Musaeus, Lange, Lessing, Sulzer—
Bodmer—Gott! mein Voß! mein Voß! wie viele sind vorangegangen!

³⁴ Seit dem Herbst 1783 hatten die Luftschiffahrten der Gebrüder Montgolfier und ihrer Rivalen großes Aufsehen erregt.

³⁵ Den hier zitierten Vers habe ich in den Stolberg'schen Gedichten von 1779 nicht gefunden.

³⁶ Blumenlesen: Anspielung auf Ramlers *Lyrische Blumenlese*; vgl. Anm. 21.

³⁷ Die in Anmerkung 32 erwähnte unrechtmäßige Ausgabe, Frankfurt und Leipzig, war tatsächlich bei Krieger in Gießen erschienen.

³⁸ Die bessere Sammlung erschien 1785: im Verzeichnis der Praenumeranten steht: "Halberstadt 10. Hr. Canon. Gleim 10 Exempl." Unterm 28. April 1785 schreibt Voß: "Endlich bekommt Vater Gleim seine Exemplare des neuen Verbüchleins" (*Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturgeschichte* VI, 135).

³⁹ Klammer Eberhard Schmidt (1746-1824) der in Halberstadt lebte.

⁴⁰ Gottlob Nathanael Fischer, geb. 1748, seit 1783 Rektor der Domschule in Halberstadt.

⁴¹ Agnes von Witzleben, seit dem 11. Juni 1782 mit Friedrich Leopold Graf zu Stolberg vermählt.

⁴² Voß war seit Juni 1777 mit Ernestine, der Schwester Boies, vermählt.

EIN BRIEF SCHILLERS AN ANTON VON KLEIN 441

Ebert ist den Unsterblichen nachgereist bis Dresden, u. ich höre, sehe nichts von ihm!

Sagen Sie, mein bester Voß, mir doch, wie's ist mit den Unsterblichen und ihren Begleiterinnen—und was sie wissen von Catharina⁴³ Stolberg!

Ewig

Ihr Gleim

Sehr eilig!

Nachtrag am Rande der 1. Seite:

Den herzlichsten Bruderkuß, wenn Gerstenberg⁴⁴ bey Ihnen ist! Ob er meine Episteln⁴⁵ auch erhalten hat?

W. KURRELMAYER

EIN BRIEF SCHILLERS AN ANTON VON KLEIN

Der hier zum Abdruck kommende Brief ist schon von Jonas¹ (Bd. I, S. 188 f., No. 105) veröffentlicht. Ihm stand jedoch nicht die seit vielen Jahren verschollene Original-Handschrift Schillers zu Verfügung, sondern nur der Druck in der *Zeitung* (Jonas schreibt: *Zeitschrift*) für die elegante Welt, 1821, No. 40, sowie Abschriften von Kuhlmei und Boxberger, die an mehreren Stellen nicht mit einander übereinstimmten. Nun weist die kürzlich in meinen Besitz gekommene Original-Handschrift Schillers noch andere, zum Teil sehr erhebliche Abweichungen auf, die einen Neudruck des Briefes rechtfertigen.

Die Handschrift ist ein Quartblatt dünnen weißen Papiers; nur die Hälfte des Wasserzeichens, eine Art Krone, ist oben in der Mitte des Blattes erhalten. Dieses ist nur einseitig beschrieben.

Der von Schiller nicht datierte Brief muß, wie Jonas nachweist, zwischen dem vierten und dem siebten Juni geschrieben sein: in

⁴³ Henriette Katharina, Gräfin zu Stolberg, Schwester der Dichter.

⁴⁴ Gerstenberg war im Juli, 1784, zum bleibenden Aufenthalt nach Eutin gekommen (*Vierteljahrschrift für Litteraturgeschichte* VI, 135).

⁴⁵ Unterm 24. Juni, 1784, hatte Voß den Empfang der Gleim'schen Episteln (vgl. Goedeke IV. 1. 87, 86) bestätigt. Gerstenberg war damals in Lübeck (*Vierteljahrschrift* a. a. O.).

¹ *Schillers Briefe. Herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Fritz Jonas. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart [1892].*

dem am 4. Juni geschriebenen Brief No. 104 schlägt Schiller die in unserem Briefe erwähnten Maßnahmen vor, in dem vom 7. Juni datierten Briefe No. 106 berichtet er an Dalberg, daß er das Manuscript wieder in Händen habe, und also alles in Ordnung sei.

S. T.

Eben erhalte ich von H. von Dalberg folgenden Einschluß an Sie, und weil ich jetzt gerade zur Unzeit zum Mittagessen wohin engagiert bin, und nicht gleich selbst zu Ihnen kommen kann, so

Der Inhalt des Briefs wird eine Bitte des Barons seyn, ein Mscrpt von mir zurückzuschicken, das durch seine Ubereilung unter andre Papiere kam. Sie werden, wenn Sie es gelesen haben, finden, daß Sie Selbst es zwar ohne Anstand lesen, aber nicht mittheilen dürften. Dalbergs und meine Ideen, die wir kürzlich der T. Gesellschaft vortrugen oder vortragen ließen, sind sehr unter unserm Wunsch aufgenommen worden, und mit Mißvergnügen habe ich von Seiten einiger Mitglieder die Bemerkung gemacht, daß alle Institute zur Beförderung der Schönen Litteratur und Kunst wenig Eingang bei Männern finden, die es unter der Würde eines Mannes halten, sich laut für etwas in diesem Fach zu erklären. Diese Empfindungen konnte ich wol einem Freunde der Litteratur gestehen, aber es ist natürlich, daß die Art wie ich sie vortrage, für diejenige die sich allenfalls getroffen glauben könnten, zu ekigt ist. Sie werden also die Güte haben, und das Manuscript entweder mir selbst, oder Dalbergen durch Rennschüb zurückgeben. Meine Idee zu einem Journal der Gesellschaft wird nie nach meinem Wunsch in Erfüllung gehn; Ich wollte einen grosen Schritt zur Beförderung des Theaters thun, und behalte mir vor, Sie bei einem Plan zu einer Mannheimer Dramaturgie als Freund und quasi Verleger um das Nähere zu fragen. Wenn ich allenfalls heute nicht in die T. Gesellschaft kommen könnte, so treffe ich Sie doch Morgen, und Wann?

Frid. Schiller.

Rückwärts in der oberen rechten Ecke Vermerk des Empfängers:

Manheim Hr Schiller den 9ten Juny—84.

W. KURRELMMEYER

ALPHONSE DE RAMBERVILLERS, LIGUEUR

On ne connaît presque rien de la jeunesse d'Alphonse de Rambervillers.¹ On sait seulement que, né probablement vers 1560, il avait fait des études de droit civil et canon à l'université de Toulouse, où

¹ Cf. sur cet écrivain, E. Duvernoy, *Alphonse de Rambervillers et le bailliage de Vic aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, dans *Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie Lorraine*, 1908; E. Duvernoy et R. Harmand, *Un auteur lorrain: Alphonse de Rambervillers*, dans *RHL.*, XVII-XVIII (1910-11); Ch. Urbain, *Alphonse de Rambervillers, correspondant de Peiresc*, dans *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, 1896.

il avait été camarade de Guillaume du Vair, aux cours du célèbre Roaldes. Il s'était établi ensuite, vers 1587, à Vic en Lorraine, où il exerça pendant toute sa vie le métier d'avocat. Outre *les Dévots élancements du poète chrestien*, qui sont son ouvrage le plus connu, il écrivit un certain nombre d'opuscules latins et français, qui sont tous d'un intérêt plus local, sinon plus réduit.

On ne savait rien sur l'attitude de ce poète lorrain pendant les troubles de la Ligue. On connaissait déjà, depuis 1852, l'épithaphe d'un certain Fouquet de La Route, gentilhomme dauphinois et gouverneur de la ville de Marsal, qui, s'étant déclaré partisan de la Ligue, avait été tué dans une rencontre. Une plaque de bronze, qui avait dû être apposée à l'endroit même où il avait été tué, nous a conservé les deux épitaphes qui lui furent consacrés, en vers latins et français. Ces vers sont modestement signés des initiales A. D. R. On n'avait pas manqué d'identifier cet anonyme avec notre écrivain, que les initiales semblent désigner assez clairement;² malgré les réserves de certains critiques, qui ne considèrent pas cette attribution comme assurée, elle s'impose comme la plus vraisemblable.³ Il n'y a pas, en effet, un autre écrivain lorrain de l'époque à qui ces initiales puissent s'appliquer.

Quant aux idées qui sont exprimées dans ces vers, elles montrent une parfaite adhésion de l'auteur à la Ligue, du moins autant que l'on peut juger d'après cette composition de circonstance, si réduite et si pauvre en idées. Fouquet de La Route est exalté et vanté comme un égal des plus grands parmi les anciens, de Trajan et de César par exemple; c'est là une preuve de plus de cet esprit partisan qui illustre toutes les compositions des écrivains de la Ligue. Il peut sembler curieux de le retrouver dans les vers de Rambervillers, dont l'œuvre connue ne contenait aucun autre écrit de cette espèce; mais nous croyons être en mesure de signaler aujourd'hui une autre composition faisant partie de la même inspiration ligueuse, et que l'on peut attribuer, avec autant de vraisemblance, à notre écrivain.

Cet ouvrage est un placard in-folio, pareil à tant d'autres publications de la même catégorie qui parurent du temps de la Ligue

² Aug. Digot, *Note sur [une] inscription qui fait partie du Musée Lorrain*, dans *Journal de la Société d'Archéologie et du Comité du Musée Lorrain*, Septembre 1852, p. 113-121.

³ E. Duvernoy et R. Harmand, dans *RHL.*, xvii (1910), 771 note.

et que nous connaissons grâce au recueil précieux de L'Estoile, intitulé avec tant d'à propos "Les belles figures et drolleries de la Ligue." La publication s'intitule "Histoire abrégée de la vie de Henry de Valois, comprinse en 50 quatrains, propres à tout le peuple françois avec le portraict de Fr. Jacques Clément, Religieux de l'Odre S. Dominique, qui l'occit le premier jour d'Aoust 1589. Par A. D. R. L." et fut imprimée à Paris, par Pierre Mercier, sans doute dans la même année 1589.⁴ Pour nous, les initiales sous lesquelles se cache l'auteur de ce pamphlet désignent Alphonse de Rambervillers, Lorrain. L'indication de la patrie de l'écrivain, qui est naturelle dans un ouvrage s'adressant à tous les Français, ne figurait pas dans la signature de l'épithaphe citée, et qui était une œuvre purement lorraine.

Le placard, imprimé sur quatre colonnes, contient un portrait de Jacques Clément, et commence par un bref récit en prose de son crime. Le régicide y est exalté sur un mode auquel nous ont habitués toutes les publications de ce genre. Jacques Clément, dont l'entreprise, au dire de l'auteur, "n'étoit en rien moindre que celle de Judith, lors qu'elle tua Holofernes," y est traité de saint, de martyr et de sauveur du peuple français. Rarement les grandes actions furent célébrées dans des termes aussi pompeux, et peu de saints eurent l'heur de se voir attribuer des panégyriques aussi enflammés :

O très-heureux personnage, par lequel la France pourra désormais vivre en repos! O très-saint et religieux homme, qui sans suscitation de personne as voulu librement exposer ta vie à la mort! Hélas! nous sçavons et confessons, très-heureux martyr, combien la France vous est redevable, l'ayant délivrée des cruautés et tyrannie de son vray Pharaon. Parquoy je prie Dieu qu'il lui plaise vous mettre avec les bienheureux au royaume de Paradis.

La poésie est à la hauteur de la prose, dans cet ouvrage qui déborde de passion. L'écrivain s'adresse à tout le peuple de France. Il se propose de lui raconter brièvement, "à celle fin que je ne t'attédie," la vie du tyran qui a été supprimée par le bienheureux moine, afin de montrer

que ce n'est rien d'un roy
Lequel ne fait ce que la loy demande.

⁴ Le texte du placard est reproduit dans les *Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L'Estoile*, Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles 1876, vol. IV, p. 103-113.

L'image de Henri III correspond à ce commencement. Il s'est fait coupable de tous les crimes, et sa vie a été un amas de fautes et de turpitude. Le poète n'y trouve rien de bon, car dès son plus tendre âge

Il a esté eslevé et nourry
En tous pechez, et voire en hérésie,
Qui luy avoit son meschant cœur pourry,
Et quant et quant son orde âme moisie.

Ce prince a toujours été un partisan de l'hérésie, qu'il a encouragée encore plus qu'il ne l'a combattue. Le poète sait, par exemple, que lors du siège de La Rochelle, le jeune duc d'Anjou, s'étant laissé acheter par les assiégés, n'avait pas exploité sa victoire ainsi qu'il aurait dû le faire. Il lui fait aussi un crime d'avoir quitté la Pologne "sans mot aucun lui dire," et d'être revenu en France, uniquement "pour la vexer, tourmenter et détruire."

D'un certain point de vue, la composition de ce pamphlet est bien naïve. Certes, Henri III n'avait pas été un grand roi, et on aurait pu faire plus d'une critique à ses actes; mais l'auteur, qui écrit pour la troupe fanatisée d'une populace qui ne regardait pas aussi loin, se contente d'observations qui ne sauraient former de véritables accusations à l'adresse du roi disparu. Il va même jusqu'à tirer une conclusion défavorable du fait qu'il pleuvait le jour du retour du roi:

Le peuple, hélas! partout s'esjouissoit
De son retour et de sa revenuë;
Mais le haut ciel, qui mieux le cognoissoit,
Pleura longtemps d'une pluye menuë.

Henri III a, en outre, pris de l'argent à ses sujets, à force d'exactions et de rapines, a poussé aux rangs les plus élevés "je ne sçay quels coquineaux et bélistres." A un certain moment il voulut tuer beaucoup de catholiques; mais le peuple, devinant ses intentions, se souleva, et ce furent les barricades qui obligèrent le roi à s'enfuir. Il jura alors de se venger, et prépara le crime de Blois. Il menaçait ensuite Paris, et déjà les bons bourgeois de la ville commençaient à craindre sa vengeance, lorsque le ciel envoya "ce bon et saint religieux Jacques Clément," qui le tue "avec un glaive et cousteau bien petit" pour une œuvre si grande.

L'auteur n'oublie pas Henri de Navarre, qu'il assure de l'inutilité des efforts qu'il était en train de faire, pour s'assurer le trône:

Roy de Navarre, à présent tu n'as plus
 Aucun crédit, ny puissance quelconque.
 Tu es matté, tu es foible et perdu:
 Quand est de Roy, tu ne le seras oncques.

Il est piquant de se rappeler, en lisant ces vers, que dix ans plus tard, Alphonse de Rambervillers demandait à être présenté à Henri IV, et lui faisait hommage d'un beau manuscrit de ses *Dévots Elancements*. Le temps avait calmé la haine de ce catholique trop fougueux. Pour le moment, il en est encore aux éloges sans fin à l'adresse de Jacques Clément, dont il veut à tout prix faire un saint:

Il faut, il faut qu'en un temple honnoré
 Il soit posé avec pompe et grand' gloire,
 En or, ou bien en cuivre eslaboré,
 Pour une ferme et durable mémoire,
 Et qu'à l'entour de son noble portrait
 Et de sa claire et luisante effigie
 Le sculpteur grave avec son meilleur trait
 Cest Epitaphe et discours de sa vie:

VOICY, CHRESTIEN, CE CLEMENT BIEN-HEUREUX,
 LEQUEL JADIS DELIVRA NOSTRE FRANCE
 DE CE VALOIS, DERNIER ROY MALHEUREUX
 QUI TINT SEIZE ANS TOUT LE PEUPLE EN SOUFFRANCE.

Les 50 quatrains de cette publication furent refaits, sans doute par l'auteur lui-même, dans une nouvelle édition, publiée dans le même format, sous ce titre: "Chanson spirituelle et action de grâces, contenant le discours de la vie et tyrannie de Henry de Valois, et la louange de frère Jacques Clément, qui nous a délivré de la main cruelle de ce tyran, le premier jour d'Aoust, l'an de grâce 1589. Dédicée à tout le peuple catholique de France, par A. D. R. L."

Cette nouvelle composition se chantait sur l'air de la chanson "France réduite en vertu." C'est d'ailleurs pour la faire adaptable à cette mélodie que le poète avait transformé la première forme de son ouvrage: écrite d'abord en vers de 10 syllabes, la *Chanson spirituelle* a été réduite à des vers de 8 syllabes, sans que, pour cela, elle ait subi de très grands changements.

Ainsi, on découvre dans Alphonse de Rambervillers un des pamphlétaires de la Ligue, un de ces poètes d'occasion dont la passion partisane entretint le feu de la révolte dans les populations soulevées par des prédicateurs et par des moines. Cela n'est pas

très étonnant, car les sentiments catholiques du poète lorrain sont bien connus; sa piété et son horreur de l'hérésie transpirent dans les vers des *Dévots élancements*, aussi bien que dans les lettres que l'on connaît de lui. Le plus étonnant, c'est que ce ligueur à l'âme farouche soit devenu plus tard un adulateur de Henri IV; mais l'âme humaine est toujours la même, et de pareils changements ne sont pas rares, surtout à cette époque de tempêtes civiles et religieuses, qui jetèrent un si grand trouble dans l'esprit de tous les Français.

AL. CIORANESCU

Université de Lyon

A. FR. *ESCHAREVOTÉE* 'ÉCORCHÉE'

Ce participe passé, se trouvant au v. 2319 de l'*Ysopet* de Lyon: *Li travail escharevotée li [au cheval] ai sa crope pomelee*, est traduit par W. Foerster 'wund gemacht, geschunden' et rapproché du passage du *Girard de Roussillon* en prose (originaire de Bourgogne, fin du XIII^e siècle): *La terre . . . fut coverte par dessus des charevostes des morz* (Rom. VII, 225) avec le substantif *charevoste* 'cadavre.' A. Thomas, Rom. XXXIX, 212 introduit un *charevate* 'fragments de chair' dans un passage du *Girard de Roussillon* en vers, mal lu par Godefroy: *D'os et de charevates corrompus et puans*, et ajoute un *charevais* 'charogne' du roman de *Blaquerne* ainsi qu'un mot du patois de Doubs, dont il dit: "J'ignore l'étymologie": *tchairvote* 'charogne.' M. J. Jud dans *Studies . . . presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester Univ. Press, 1939), p. 227, en recensant les mots dialectaux de l'*Ysopet* de Lyon trahissant l'origine franc-comtoise, voit dans le verbe **escharevoter* et *charevoste* 'charogne' un CARNE REPOSITA 'viande enfouie' où REPONERE subirait le traitement -p- > -v- du lyonnais *revondre* 'enfouir, recouvrir.' Mais d'abord un CARNE REPOSITA n'est pas un nexus de mots courant en latin, qui aurait, par conséquent, pu se cristalliser en roman, ensuite l'*s* devant -t- qu'il faut pour l'étymologie n'est attesté qu'une fois dans cette famille de mots, et dans un texte postérieur, nulle trace non plus d'un double -r- CARO REPOSITA et enfin les formes *charevate*, *charevais* ne s'expliquent pas dans cette hypothèse.

Je pense qu'il s'agit d'un reflet de SCARABAEUS, REW^s 7658:

a. fr. *esc(h)arbote* 'escarbot, scarabée' (God. énumère des passages comme *l'escharbotte / Qui . . . suy le chemin des charrettes, Es estrons des chevaux se boutte et aucunes bestes ont .vi. pies comme les escarbotes et les mouches*) et le verbe correspondant *esc(h)arbotter* 'éparpiller le feu' (chez Rabelais accouplé à *fouger* et conservé en patois charentais, poitevin et berrichon, cf. le prov. mod. *escarbouta* au même sens),¹ prov. mod. *escarava(i)*, *escaravach*, *escar(a)bat*, *escarabas* 'escarbot' (*faire l'escarava* 'se poursuivre à quatre pattes, jeu d'enfant'). Le mouvement alerte des six pattes a mené au sens de 'grifonner, faire des pattes de mouche'; it. *scarabocchiare*; esp. *hacer escaravajos* et *escaravajear* 'escarbouiller, barbouiller & gaster comme un papier en jetant de l'encre dessus avec la plume, espapilloter, faire des pasteux en écrivant' (Oudin), de *escaravajo* 'écharbot'; prov. mod., mallorqu. *escarabat* 'grifouillage,' et de là on arrive (cf. le rapport étymologique de l'allemand *kritzeln* avec *kratzen*) facilement à 'égratigner, écorcher': **escharevoter*, dont est dérivé le postverbal (*es*)*charevote* 'viande écorchée' > 'fragments de chair,' 'cadavre' (peut-être sous l'influence de *chair*, qui aura fait tomber le *es*). Ce sens d' 'égratigner' est attesté par le catal. *escar(a)botar* 'ferir una cosa superficialment, rozar, desgastar' (*m'he escarabotat un gra, una esgarrinechada*) et *escaravat* 'rabot,' *Dicc. Aguiló*. Il est moins probable que l'activité "écharbottante" de ces insectes (remuant les étrons et la chair pourrie, cf. un des textes a. fr. cité plus haut et le nom fr. de l'écharbot 'fouille-merde' = *scarabaeus sterco-*

¹ Est empruntée au fr. la famille du catalan (*Dicc. Aguiló*) *arbotar* 'moure's, remenar-se un líquid dintre el receptacle, vessar per la part superior' (*porta aquesta ampolla i no arbotis l'aigua*), *arbot(ada)*, *arabascat* (+ *chubasco*) 'xàfec d'aigua, chubasco,' à Empordà ou *arbot*, à Vich ou *escarabotit* 'ou covat sense èxit' (litt. l'oeuf dans lequel quelque chose remue, appelé ailleurs ou *batoc*, de 'battre'). D'autre part le catalan connaît un *escarabitllarse* 'se hàter' et le prov. un *escarrabilha* 'animer,' *car(a)vilha* 'chicaner, critiquer' (cf. all. *sticheln*), formes autoctones que j'ai naguère reconduites (v. REW³) à *SCARABAEUS*. Le caractère remuant et incertain de la bête semble être reflété par le fourmillement et l'expansion (phonétique, morphologique et sémantique) des formes romanes. Le scarabée, comme le papillon, la chauve-souris etc., est de ces bêtes qui transmettent pour ainsi dire leur instabilité à l'homme qui les observe et doit les dénommer. Il y a une fermeté d'assiette différente dans l'individu parlant selon qu'il a à faire à des phénomènes ou des êtres qui le 'tranquillissent' ou l' 'énervent' — observation que nous pouvons faire dans la vie courante.

rarius) ait pu donner au verbe **escharevoter* l'idée 'fourgonner dans la charogne' et que de là le sens des substantifs 'charogne' se soit établi. Les variantes en *-ate*, *-ais* s'expliquent par le parallélisme phonétique ou suffixal des formes provençales. On notera que les formes franc-comtoises etc. (*es*)*charevote*, *charevate*, *charevas* ainsi que les provençales remontent à un SCARABAEUS avec *a* intertonique conservé, alors que le fr. *écharbot* avec *-rb-* se base sur un *SCARBAEUS dissimilé.

LEO SPITZER

ROUSSEAU HERO-WORSHIP

AN UNPUBLISHED INTIMATE RECORD OF 1766

Sir Robert Liston (1742-1836) was a Scottish linguist, skilled in ten languages, and a successful diplomatist, variously British envoy at Madrid, Stockholm, Washington, the Hague, and Constantinople. His career thus belongs primarily to politics. But in early manhood he touched upon the realm of literature, being taken under the patronage of no less a figure than David Hume, chief intellect of the republic of letters of the mid-eighteenth century. Through Hume's influence, Liston might have become established in the literary realm as Parmese professor of modern languages, but, as it finally turned out to the great disgust of Turgot as well as of Hume, "They will have nothing but a Papist."¹ Yet it was through Hume that Liston demonstrated that he had the makings of another Boswell—though with the cardinal defect of modesty.

In 1766 the twenty-four year old Robert Liston was residing in Paris as private tutor to Gilbert and Hugh Elliot at the Abbé Choquart's Academy, Barrière St. Dominique. Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, the boys' father, not entirely confident that even a brilliant and respected young tutor might not be led astray by the iniquities of Paris, "where," as he imagined, "not to be dissipated is hardly to have an existence,"² placed his sons' education and—privately—the tutor himself, under the general supervision of his

¹ Hume, *Letters* (ed. J. Y. T. Greig, Oxford, 1932), II, 181.

² *Ibid.*, I, 499 n.

close friend, David Hume. Hume, then Chargé d'Affaires at the British legation and reigning lion of the Parisian *salons*, Sir Gilbert argued with reason, would form a bulwark of morality to safeguard both the boys and their preceptor.

But to the youthful Liston the reputation of even *le bon David* was aggrandized by his association with the more spectacular Rousseau. Early in January 1766, Hume was preparing to leave Paris, taking Jean-Jacques to England in order to shelter him from the persecutions of the bigots of Geneva. Secretly also the benevolent Hume harbored the intention of securing for his "pupil" a pension from the king of England. The greatness of Hume's heart allowed him as yet no inkling of the viper he was taking to his bosom! It was at this idyllic moment, January 13, that Liston wrote to his sister in Scotland a charmingly guileless account of how he had finally seen his great hero, Rousseau, the previous week, just before he set out for London with Hume. But Liston must be allowed to speak for himself.³

You perhaps know that the celebrated Monsieur Rousseau, has been obliged to quit Geneva for the religious part of his Emilius, that he has been flying about Switzerland for some time to avoid persecution and assassination, and that he could find no asylum to secure him from the zeal of these *overmuch righteous* pastors; you perhaps know likewise, that, in consequence of an invitation from David Hume, he came here, and is now on his way to England, and that he is to be boarded in a house at Fulham, a village a little way up the river from London. But you surely don't know what I am going to tell you.—You know I am a great admirer of Rousseau, and no man has a more irresistible Curiosity to see great men than I. But as all M. Rousseau's former acquaintances crowded to see him, and I had been always told he was the shyest and most misanthropical creature in the world, I did not chuse to ask Mr. Hume to make me acquainted with him. However, for fear he should die before I returned to London, I resolved to see him once before he went away, and with this view went to the Street where he lodged the morning he set off, in order to stare at him as he and David were going into their post-chaise. After waiting an hour or two in a Coffee-house opposite, I saw Mr. Hume come out and go toward the chair. Now, thought I, now is the time. I run out and got as near the chaise⁴ as possible. But behold! no Rousseau appeared.

³ The National Library of Scotland, Liston Papers, Bundle I: Letter of Robert Liston, Jan. 13, 1766, ff. 2-3. Though the Liston Papers are not as yet completely catalogued, this letter was made available to me through the kindness of the Librarian, Dr. Henry W. Meikle.

⁴ *the chaise* is crossed out.

David observed me, and expressed some surprise at seeing me there. I am just come to have a peep at Jean Jacques, says I; I beg you'll not take any notice of me, but let me stare in full liberty—"No no you shall go in and I'll present you to him."—I'd rather not, I've nothing to say to him, and he's so shy. "Well, but we'll perhaps be long before we're ready; you shall at least go in, and sit in an antichamber⁶ where you'll see him at [your ease]." ⁶ Saying this he pulled me in by the arm. I waited in [a] ⁶ parlour [and when] ⁶ said famous personage came through carrying out a bundle to his chaise, I made him a low bow which he returned. Mr. Hume in the inner room, while Rousseau was absent, had told the Countess of Boufflers (a very famous woman and a great protectress of men of learning) that I was in the anti chamber,⁵ and my motives for coming. She came out immediately, commended my curiosity, made me some compliments, and insisted upon introducing me to Jean Jacques. So when he came back she and Mr. Hume together presented me to him. I can't enter into the particulars of our Conversation,—but upon the whole he received me very well. I was about an hour there, saw him dine, and had the Honour to help him into the Chaise. He said he would be glad to crack with me when I came to England, &c.—His person is very thin & delicate looking, his face, and especially his sharp black Eyes promise every thing he has shown himself possessed of. His manners simple and affable. If I had more paper I would say more. Adieu my Dear—

R. Liston.

ERNEST C. MOSSNER

Guggenheim Memorial Foundation

THE DATE OF MME DESHOULIÈRES'S PARODY OF *LE CID*

Among XVII century parodies of drama one of the cleverest is that of the *précieuse* poetess Mme Deshoulières. It belongs among the many pieces that used the *stances* of the *Cid* as a vehicle of ridicule and invective. Its ample title fully announces the subject to be lampooned: *Parodie de la Scène sixième, de l'Acte premier du Cid de M. Corneille, contenant les Regrets de M. du Perrier, sur le Prix de l'Académie*.¹ This is Charles Du Périer, to whose uncle, François, Malherbe addressed the famous lines of his *Consolation* and who was esteemed as a writer of French and Latin verse. He

⁶ *Sic*.

⁶ MS. damaged.

¹ Mme and Mlle Deshoulières, *Œuvres*, Paris, Prault fils, 1753, II, 164-6.

was, in fact, thought of highly enough by Chapelain to be awarded, in 1663, a pension of 800 livres.²

In 1671 the French Academy created two prize awards, each of 300 l., to be given every second year to the winners of contests in eloquence and in poetry. A subject was announced on which the various contestants would submit an unsigned poem and a sealed envelope bearing their name. Du Périer, together with La Monnoie, won this prize twice consecutively, in the years 1681 and 1683. In 1685 the award was not made, but two years later it went to Mlle Deshoulières for the best ode on *Le soin que le Roi prend de l'éducation de sa Noblesse dans ses Places & dans Saint-Cyr* (*Œuvres*, II, 199-203).³ Now it will be noted that the disgruntled poet speaking in the parody says:

On ose rejeter des Vers dont je suis père:
J'attire en murmurant, des Auteurs la colère;
J'attire leur mépris en ne me vengeant pas.
Falloit-il que ma langue, à mon Ode infidelle,
Fit cabaler contr'elle?

We know then that the poem he submitted to the Academy was an ode. The chances are that its subject was the same as that on which Mlle Deshoulières wrote her winning ode. Elsewhere, Du Périer says

Pension, mon unique amour,
Qu'on alloit rétablir sans cette tyrannie. . .

That is, he had already received a *pension* (300 l.) and expected to have it renewed by winning the prize a consecutive time. He cannot be referring to the contest that took place in 1685, for that

² P. Clément, *Histoire de Colbert*, 1846, p. 188. Born at Aix-en-Provence in the early years of the century, died at Paris, March 28, 1692. According to Michaud, *Biog. univ.*, 1880, he excelled as a writer of Latin poetry. He was known to be excessively vain (cf. *ibid.* and Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. gén.*, 1856-7). It is said that the least aspersion cast upon his writings would immediately provoke a quarrel and alienate his friendship. Legend has it that on one occasion he said to d'Herbelot: "Il n'y a que les sots, qui n'estiment pas mes vers." Whereupon d'Herbelot answered that "Stultorum infinitus est numerus." We find listed under his name in the catalogue of the Bibl. Nat. a Provençal poem: *Leis Mousquetaires prouvenssaux, à moussu lou chevalié de Fourbin, sonnet*, s. l., 1673, in-4, 1 p.

³ Pellisson and d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie française*, Paris, Didier, 1858, II, 15.

year, as we have shown, no award was made; moreover, Du Périer's complaint is that it was given to someone else.⁴ The reference then can only be to 1687; the year when Mlle Deshoulières was chosen as the recipient of the prize money. These facts permit us to date the parody *circa* 1687 or soon afterwards. Du Périer's vanity must have suffered at the thought that the work of a young girl had been preferred to his own and one can well imagine his voicing criticism of the choice. It is not surprising then that Mme Deshoulières should ridicule a man who, though but a few years previously (1684) he had sung her praises in two very insipid "balades,"⁵ had shown disapproval of her daughter's writings.

JOSEPH F. PRIVITERA

Saint Louis University

A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF A *JEU DE SCÈNE* IN MOLIÈRE'S *ÉCOLE DES MARIS*

Despois¹ and Martinenche² suggest as a source of the *jeu de scène* in Molière's *École des maris*, II, 9, where Isabelle gives her hand to Valère to be kissed, a scene in Lope's *La discreta enamorada*, but there is not a very close parallel. In the Spanish, a father is in love with the girl loved by his son, whom she loves. The scene referred to, which is in Act II, is as follows: The son at his father's command comes to kiss his future stepmother's hand, to do her homage. While he does so, kneeling, amid much flattery which angers the father, he gives the girl a note; she gives him her blessing. While the father's attention is held by her mother, the girl reads the note, learning that the young man is to be sent away. The latter wants to embrace her. She tells him that she will pretend to fall and that he can do so as he lifts her up. This is carried out.

Compare with this complicated scene the simplicity of the French, where the kiss is given without so much ado: "Elle fait semblant d'embrasser Sganarelle, et donne sa main à baiser à Valère."

⁴ [Pension] En te donnant. . . .

⁵ Cf. the 1780 (London) edition of her works, pp. 74-7.

¹ *G. E. F.* edition of Molière, II (1875), 341.

² *RHL.*, v (1898), 112.

There is another Spanish play in which there is a giving-of-a-kiss; this case seems to me to be closer to the French and a more probable source. In *No hay vida como la honra* by Juan Pérez de Montalbán (published in 1632 in *Para todos*), Leonor gives her hand to her lover, Carlos, to kiss, as she offers an embrace to Fernando, her cousin and *novio*, whom she is meeting for the first time. It is Carlos who brings him to her house and while Carlos is speaking to her about Fernando, she arranges to give him her left hand as she embraces the cousin, an act which is later performed: "Llégase por detrás Carlos, y besa la mano."³

One can see that while the general scene does not coincide with the French, there is a close similarity in the method of giving the hand to be kissed. It is to this point that I have wished to call attention.

J. H. PARKER

University of Toronto

A NOTE ON THE SOURCES OF "VENGANZA CATALANA"

García Gutiérrez had two main sources for his *Venganza catalana* (1864): Francisco de Moncada's *Expedición de los catalanes y aragoneses contra turcos y griegos* and Ramón Muntaner's *Chronica, o descripció dels fets, e hazanyes del inclyt Rey Don Jaume. . .*. Quotations from both are presented at the end of the printed versions of the play. Since both sources present essentially the same facts, one might wonder as to their relative importance. Six of the nine quotations are from Muntaner, and from him come the names of two characters in the play: Gircón and Perich de Naclara. In Moncada these names appear as George and Pedro de Maclara respectively. The name of Roger de Flor's former ship, "The Falcon" (*Venganza catalana*, Act II, sc. xv) is also taken from Muntaner (Chap. cxciv). Moncada does not name it.

However, even apart from the three quotations, it can be definitely shown that García Gutiérrez was at least fairly familiar with Moncada's *Expedición*. In Act I, sc. iii of the play reference is made

³ Act I, in *B. A. E.*, XLV, 481.

to Amurat and Carcano, names which are not mentioned by Muntaner. Moncada and García Gutiérrez use both *Alanos* and *Masagetas* for the name of the Massagetae; Muntaner uses only *Alans*. The name Alejo occurs only in Moncada. The names of the other historical characters in the play may have come from either historian. We may further observe that in the first three acts of *Venganza catalana* direct reference is made only to Muntaner, while the three citations from Moncada annotate only the fourth and last act. It is perfectly possible that this may represent the relative importance of the two sources, since there is no historical event (only names of characters and places) in the first three acts which Muntaner might not have furnished, and none in Act IV which might not have come from Moncada.

In general, the spirit of the play, so highly favorable to Roger and to his supposedly Spanish followers, is closer to Muntaner than to Moncada, for the latter displays greater poise and less patriotic partiality. It is not our purpose in this note to comment upon García Gutiérrez's distortion of history to suit his own artistic ends.

N. B. ADAMS

W. C. SALLEY

University of North Carolina

REVIEWS

The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude. By J. E. BERNARD, JR. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 228. \$3.00.

Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in "King John." By GERARD M. GREENEWALD. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1938. Pp. x + 195. \$1.50.

The Warde. By THOMAS NEALE. Edited by JOHN ARTHUR MITCHELL. Philadelphia, 1937. Pp. viii + 100.

The Invisible World. A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama. By ROBERT HUNTER WEST. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 278.

- Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der Englischen Renaissance.* By BERTA SIEBECK. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1939. Pp. xvi + 198.
- Shakespeare Persönliches aus Welt und Werk.* By ROBERT WOLLENBERG. Berlin: Dr. Emil Ebering, 1939. Pp. 140.
- The Fourth Forger. William Ireland and the Shakespeare Papers.* By JOHN MAIR. New York: Macmillan, 1939. Pp. xvi + 244. \$2.75.
- Five Elizabethan Tragedies.* Edited by A. K. McILWRAITH. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xx + 400. \$.80.
- Shakespeare Studies. Macbeth.* By BLANCHE COLES. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1938. Pp. xiv + 290. \$2.50.
- Die Zusätze zur "Spanish Tragedy."* By LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1938. Pp. 82. RM 3.
- The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero.* By LEVIN LUDWIG SCHÜCKING. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. 29. \$.60.
- The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure.* By R. W. CHAMBERS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 60. \$1.50.
- Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa.* By WILHELM FRANZ. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1939. Pp. xl + 730. RM 26.
- Shakespeare Criticism. An Essay in Synthesis.* By C. NARAYANA MENON. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. viii + 276. \$1.75.
- Shakespeare.* By MARK VAN DOREN. New York: Holt, 1939. Pp. viii + 344. \$3.00.
- Studies in Metaphysical Poetry.* By THEODORE SPENCER and MARK VAN DOREN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 88. \$1.50.
- Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights.* By HENRY W. WELLS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 328. \$2.75.

A "telegraphic" review upon materials from an editorial grab-bag may as well begin at the beginning, with the grubbers around the foundations of knowledge, and examine the doctoral dissertations.

Dr. Bernard (Yale) analyzes the prosody of seventy-two items classified as Tudor Interludes. There is a great deal of calling

things what they are not, but the assigned nomenclature is used consistently with itself, so that the bulk of the work is at least systematic—we can hardly speak of any system of prosody yet as scientific. He could easily have improved the chronology, by examining Professor Reed's dating of *Four Elements*, Dr. Pollard's of Heywood's *Weather*, etc. His own researches, however, have been thoroughly and competently done. He finds that in general the playwrights attempted to vary "their verse in accord with what took place in the drama." But prose and blank verse supplanted these devices at the end of the sixteenth century. Prosodic habits perhaps shed some light on questions of attributed authorship for certain plays. This is an able doctoral dissertation.

Next is the dissertation of "Rev. Gerard M. Greenewald, O. M. Cap., M. A., S. T. B." (Catholic University of America). "Some critics interpret *King John* according to the prevalent religious and political attitude of their own day—to say nothing of their own personal prejudices . . . Now, in this study of the play the method pursued is, of course, purely objective"—(anything but). The author mistakes the equivalent of "sirreverence" for a "curt apology" and recognition of the Pope's spiritual supremacy by King John, and upon that foundation builds high. Frankly, the author exhibits no technical training in literature whatever, and little first-hand reading in Shakspeare or the period, not even Roman Catholic source materials. The full parallel between the curse pronounced on Shakspeare's John and the actual one pronounced on Queen Elizabeth may be of interest.

Dr. Mitchell (Pennsylvania) says, "The purpose of this thesis is to edit for the first time the manuscript play, *The Warde*, by Thomas Neale . . . In this introduction will be found an account of the life of Thomas Neale, an account of his other writings, extant and lost, a discussion of *The Warde*, its plot and its relation to the drama of the period, and a consideration of the text and its problems." The author is interested chiefly in the autobiographical aspects of the play, taking some three-fourths of his preface for this phase, but at that overlooking the major fact that the court of wards was under fire at this period. He catches an explicit allusion to Iago and Roderigo, but fails to recognize the bear Sackerson, hence the relationship between Simple and Slender. The actual work of editing has been rather perfunctorily and superficially done. Even if we should consider this a passable doctoral dissertation, still we may question whether it should have been put into print before it was a great deal more.

So Dr. Bernard well sustains the tradition set by his elders at Yale; Dr. Mitchell is "o'erparted"; and the other specimen is not what is ordinarily considered a doctoral dissertation at all.

In a second group of six, we turn next to the work of Mr. West, which has the air of having once been a doctoral dissertation. The first quarter is devoted to "The Literature and Background of

Sixteenth Century Pneumatology," being an excellent presentation of terms and controversies in sixteenth-century pneumatology. The author then passes selected bits of guinea-pig plays through the sausage-grinder of systematic pneumatology to be ground exceeding small—it is a good sausage-grinder—and they stay ground! There are no summaries of results either for the chapters or for the study as a whole, but it becomes clear that sixteenth-century plays can have little direct connection with the systematic—not scientific!—pneumatologists.

Says Miss Siebeck, "Die Aufgabe dieser Arbeit ist es, den Ruhm Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance in seiner Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung zu untersuchen." Here is presented the Renaissance Paradise, "eine griechische Wiedergeburt," with "Puritanismus, der eigentliche Zerstörer der Renaissance" playing the devil with it all, including "das Bild Sidneys." In spite of this pre-"possessed" ideology, the copious materials can be made to speak for themselves, especially those on Mary Pembroke's circle, and to give an excellent idea both of what Sidney meant to his contemporaries and of how he came to mean that. One wishes that both Mr. West and Miss Siebeck had worked from facts to theories.

Another study in German, by Robert Wollenberg, "Doktor der Medizin und Professor der Psychiatrie," on *Shakespeare Persönliches* does attempt to begin from the facts; but is merely a layman's compilation (his technical training hardly shows).

Mr. Mair's *Fourth Forger* deals too popularly and satirically for truth with Ireland's Shakspeare forgeries. As soon as Shakspeare scholars, and actors, actually got access to the materials, the verdict was not in doubt. The same kind of "authority" was deceived then, as now annually by genuine signatures, "scientific" proofs from alleged faked portraits of Oxford, etc., though Mr. Mair does not suspect it.

We notice next a couple of textbooks. Mr. McIlwraith prints, and adapts from standard editions matter upon, *Thyestes* (Heywood's translation), *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Arden of Feversham*, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. This is a conservative summary on early tragedy, from conservative sources, which are now usually in need of some modernizing.

Mrs. Coles says of her *Macbeth*, "The intention has been to present, for the student and the serious reader, a supplementary manual to be used with Shakespeare's text. All the lines of the play have been paraphrased; the major problems of the drama have been considered, and the several viewpoints of recognized commentators quoted in brief. The study of character is again the motif of the work," as in her *Hamlet*. Some will not care to gossip over the back fence about Renaissance stage characters as "living people"; others may deny that there is any pedagogical place for such a commentary. The work has been done with such conscious

and perfect propriety that it might be used with safety in a Victorian seminary for young ladies. They would never know even about the "shard-born beetle"—Mrs. Coles doesn't—, unless in an unguarded moment they should happen to look it up in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. One gets the impression that Shakspeare had examined with unwonted diligence the Furness Variorum of *Macbeth*—as, of course, he *ought* to have done. And that his selections of materials were, for him, remarkably unElizabethan.

For the six items in this second group, as for the three dissertations, at least two-thirds of the printing space could have been saved. The remaining eight items of the elders in our third group could profitably be cut at least in half. It is obvious where the fault lies for congested "scholarly" publication.

Our third class consists of Shakspearean criticism and closely allied work. Professor Schücking asks concerning *The Spanish Tragedy*, "Sind die 'additions' in der Tat Erweiterungen des ursprünglichen Stückes, oder stellen sie nicht—zum mindesten in ihrer Mehrzahl—einen Ersatz von Teilen dar, die man aus irgendwelchen Gründen ausschalten wollte?" He argues that they are substitutions, first because they would make the play too long, not realizing that all plays were more or less cut and adapted for acting; second because of their nature in fitting the play to a newer taste, though such changes might as well be additions as substitutions. Not even his best illustration is a wholly satisfactory substitute, as he himself later admits in trying to substantiate a different theory. The other cases are even more amusing attempts to force facts to fit a theory. Because of supposed relationships to other plays, the additions are dated January, 1597, and on psychological grounds assigned to one individual for one occasion. Three endings are discovered for the play, and a fourth added in a footnote; on the same principles, there can be more, if desired. There are various general conclusions concerning the proper ordering of the text, based on the previous conclusions, which are based fundamentally on Professor Schücking's impressions only.

In his Shakspeare lecture, Professor Schücking asks, "is not a certain literary taste which he shared with his time to be observed in his writings, and would not the perception of the characteristic traits of this taste help us to a better understanding of his work?"; a taste which he labels baroque. He objects that the real aim of tragedy is usually stated in classical terms, whereas that real aim was sensation. Instead of the mirror passage in *Hamlet* he would substitute another, which he does not know is from Quintilian, and a statement of Drayton's, which rests on Horace, though again he does not appear to know. Elizabethan tragedy was born of Senecan tragedy, interpreted in terms of the Latin masters of oratory, Cicero and Quintilian, and of Horace, the great theorist on poetical excellence. This was purest grammar-school Renaissance; there is no need for such an extraneous cacophany as baroque. In both

these items, Professor Schücking makes many interesting observations, but one wishes he would derive his theories from his facts instead of finding facts to substantiate theories.

In all these respects, the Shakspeare lecture of Professor R. W. Chambers on *Measure for Measure* is a model. Underlying the work of Stopford Brooke and Dowden is the fallacious assumption that the plays of Shakspeare reflect his actual moods, and those who have been reared on those texts find it difficult to disabuse themselves of it. The first half of this lecture most charmingly demolishes that assumption, as a necessary preliminary to considering *Measure for Measure*, which has suffered so much from it. On the matter of tragedy before the tragic period, Professor Chambers might have pointed out also that in 1598 Francis Meres found six tragedies to balance against six comedies. The second half of the lecture considers *Measure for Measure* without conditioning presuppositions. No summary is possible, and if it were, the reviewer would not give it. For he would not deprive the reader of the benediction of a great spirit, which he must not fail to seek in the lecture itself. If there has been a greater piece of Shakspearean criticism since Bradley, the reviewer does not recall it. (Incidentally, the reviewer does not agree fully with either of them.) This is the true historical and human method, in the hands of a very great master, personally as well as technically.

One need only mention the fourth edition of the *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, by Professor Wilhelm Franz of Tübingen, which first appeared in 1898-9. Changes and additions for the second and third editions have in this edition been fully incorporated in the text; American speech has upon occasion been considered; and the section on metrics has been reshaped.

So far, we have been considering the works of those who at least pretend to be objective in the bases of their judgments, and usually attempt to proceed from fact to judgment. Not so the work of Professor C. Narayana Menon of Benares Hindu University. Developing a theory of literary criticism from mystical Indian philosophy, he applies it to pieces and patches of Shakspeare. He stresses the subjective reaction with his philosophic impressionism as much as we with our mechanistic view stress the objective fact which occasions the subjective reaction. But Professor Menon devotes about half as much space to compact notes and bibliography covering a great proportion of outstanding and recent contributions on the subject, as he does to text. Work so founded may be philosophically impressionistic; but one who has been so thoroughly prepared is likely to be impressed very much like any other thorough scholar. Because Professor Menon is an Indian, his subjective impressions are interestingly different—which he would deny, no doubt.

Presumably we are also to consider Professor Mark Van Doren's *Shakespeare* either as a critical work or as a textbook. The author

lays down no critical principles, but says, "Anyone at all will see that my favorite among the older critics is Dr. Johnson." What we are offered is a personally conducted tour through Shakspeare by "a poet in his own right." As nearly as the reviewer can make out from "spotting" through, only a comparatively small part of the works of Shakspeare was written by "a poet" or "the poet," and these bits of real poetry Professor Van Doren proposes to point out; the drossy remainder is left to the biographer, historian, etc. There is no disputing about tastes, but the reviewer is glad he is not a poet-critic; there would then be so much in Shakspeare that he would not be permitted to enjoy. (After all, aren't these merely lecture notes handed down ex-cathedra to impress undergraduates?)

A pamphlet by Professors Spencer and Van Doren is the result of a happy thought on the part of the Seventeenth Century Section of the M. L. A. in inviting them "to present a survey and analysis of the scholarly and critical work which has been done on metaphysical poetry during the past twenty-five years," some reviews excepted. The useful bibliography of metaphysical poetry as they define it was done by Professor Spencer, "With the assistance of Evelyn Orr." The professors then parted scholarship and criticism between them for introductory essays, despite the fact, as Professor Spencer as scholar complains, that no such division is in fact possible. Both felt compelled to be more or less "contemporaneous" in their estimate of metaphysical poetry, especially Professor Van Doren. With one eye on his contemporaneity and the other on the "critic," Mr. T. S. Eliot, he makes a capital Y out of the resulting dilemma, thus getting three horns instead of the conventional two on which to gore contemporaneity (pseudo-seventeenth century style) to little bits spread all over the intermediate points—apparently that Y is also well-studded with spikes. Scholars will find the bibliography useful; if critics be other than scholars, to them the reviewer does not presume to speak.

Like his colleague with the lacerated contemporaneity, Professor Wells thinks, "Samuel Johnson's Preface to his *Shakespeare* remains probably the finest critical essay." His own "book as a whole analyzes major tendencies in the drama from 1576 to 1642 . . . My treatment has been critical, not chronological . . . it represents no new research." The work is hard to follow, since thought and structure from sentence up need a sharpening of focus. As the author himself indicates, he groups selected plays in such a way as to bring out the chosen theme of each of twelve essays. Not only does he regroup, but he also uses terms in his own sense. By this juggling with terms, the final chapter of conclusions systematically thrusts the Hell of the Middle Ages into the Elysium of the Renaissance. Having performed this feat, the author then eliminates the Renaissance altogether. It was merely a "curious poise or equilibrium between medieval and modern influences," which was broken in 1611, when Shakspeare retired. To place "the water-

shed between the two movements" at Shakspeare's retirement is to overlook what happened to Shakspeare himself in his final period, as the late Professor Thorndike would have admonished his junior colleague. There is never any watershed in literary movements; they are not that simple. No amount of essaying upon objective materials rearranged according to subjective impressions will change that fact. It is the same kind of fallacy which Professor Chambers destroys for Stopford Brooke and Dowden.

Thus our three self-confessed critics all claim overtly or tacitly subjective standards, though Professor Menon claims a philosophic impressionism tested by the outstanding works in the field. Such a subjectivity is at least cognizant of objective facts. The reviewer prefers the school of Bradley, so ably illustrated in our group of works by the lecture of Professor R. W. Chambers. There all the objective facts—historical, chronological, textual, etc.—meet in a great personality to produce a subjectivity tuned to understand the master. And emotional understanding is all. All in all.

T. W. BALDWIN

University of Illinois

The Passionate Pilgrim by William Shakespeare. Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, with an Introduction by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. New York and London: For the Trustees of Amherst College, Charles Scribners' Sons, 1939. Pp. lxxvi + sigs. A1-D8. \$4.00.

Dr Adams and all concerned in the administration of the Folger Shakespeare Library have placed students under a deep debt of gratitude for this remarkably thorough and scholarly work. It is no small thing to have an excellent collotype reproduction of the strange and in part unique copy of the well-known Shakespearian miscellany that forms part of the wonderful little volume discovered twenty years ago in the muniment room at Longner Hall. It is an added blessing to have an introduction of over sixty pages in which Dr Adams discusses every aspect of the problems that cluster round it. One can have nothing but admiration for the way in which these problems have been attacked and solved by Dr Adams and his staff.

The book is a composite one, being made up of sheets derived from two different editions; one the edition formerly regarded as the first, the other an edition now recognized as being yet earlier. The proof of this Dr Adams sets out in the form of a conjectural account of how the volume assumed its present form. Whether all the details of this reconstruction are correct, it is, of course, impossible to say, but of the central fact of priority there can be no

doubt. The short proof is this. In what is now claimed as the first edition (of which unique copies of sheets A and C survive in the Folger volume) each several poem begins a fresh recto page. Since most of the poems do not exceed one page in length, this means that most of the versos are blank, though a few longer poems run through several consecutive pages (rectos and versos). The absence, however, of any headings or numbering to the poems makes the arrangement obscure, and it was clearly not understood by the compositor of what is now recognized as the second edition, who set up the matter on recto pages only, except where towards the end he had to crowd it for lack of space. There are, of course, subsidiary arguments that confirm this conclusion, including some interesting textual points, but there would in any case be no escaping the implication of the bibliographical evidence.

The whole of the rather disreputable history of this famous miscellany comes in for lucid discussion, and points with irony the fact that within twenty-five years of his piratical assault William Jaggard had established his reputation for all time as mainly responsible for the authorized collection of Shakespeare's plays. The individual poems of *The Passionate Pilgrim* are drawn from many different sources. They no doubt for the most part constituted the commonplace-book of some literary amateur of the time, the type of collection of which many examples still survive. There are several in the Folger Library containing variant versions of poems in the *Pilgrim*—the most interesting belonged about 1600 to 'Anne Cornwaleys,' probably the daughter of Sir William Cornwallis of Brome Hall, who ten years later became Countess of Argyll. These alternative versions are duly printed at the end of the introduction.

Dr Adams and his assistants have done their work with such minute and loving care that hardly any points of detail invite comment, still less criticism. Only one or two observations suggest themselves.

In the second edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* stanzas 3-4 and 5-6 of poem XVIII are transposed. This means the interchange of the type of D2 and D3 (rectos). 'It may be that the error arose in the course of imposition,' Dr Adams writes; and he quotes Moxon to the effect that 'It sometimes chanceth that a Compositor . . . Transposes two Pages' (p. xlv). There can be little doubt that it is an error of imposition: the alternative would be a transposition of C5 verso and C6 recto in the copy of the first edition from which it was printed, which seems out of the question. But the usual error of the kind, of which Moxon was probably thinking, is the interchange of two adjacent pages in the same forme. It should be observed that here we have to do with the interchange of opposite corner pages in opposite formes, a much stranger error.

In the first edition, and in the latter half of the second, the leaves are not signed beyond the first of each quire. It was this, of course,

that allowed the transposition just mentioned to escape detection. Dr Adams remarks that 'The compositor, it would seem, thought that in so small a pamphlet the signing of the quires alone would be adequate' (p. xlv). I do not see that the size of the book is relevant. However many the quires, the signing of the first leaf of each is sufficient to ensure their correct order: the signing of the other leaves is a safeguard against incorrect folding, or perfecting, or imposition; accidents which occur within the quires and are independent of their number.

By a curious slip on p. xxii (note 3) Mr Harry Farr, the Cardiff Librarian, appears as Henry Fair.

I should like to close with a further expression of gratitude for a very delightful volume.

W. W. GREG

London, England

The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years. Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. OXFORD: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1939. 3 vols., xxxviii + 1408 pp. \$21.00.

Another of Professor De Selincourt's numerous and important contributions to scholarship is now concluded. The six volumes of Wordsworth correspondence extending to almost 3000 pages include 1710 letters and if to these are added the 137, which are not here reprinted, in the Crabb Robinson and in the Henry Reed volumes the total reaches 1847.¹ As might be expected, these final volumes are the least interesting and least significant of the whole. Dorothy was ill much of the time and the poet usually wrote on business or family affairs, to thank authors for the gift of their books, to raise money to erect a second church in Cockermouth, to urge extending the period of copyright, or to lament the sad condition of the times. Many of the letters are, indeed, disheartening. Wordsworth's bitter hostility to the Reform Bill, to the Catholic Relief Bill, to universal suffrage, to non-conformity, to the extension of the railroad into the lake district, his dislike of France, his loss of faith in democracy and his distrust of all change suggest the contracting sympathies, the hardening prejudices of an old age more often gloomy than serene or mellow. It is painful to read such sentences as these:

¹ Edith Morley's *Correspondence of C. R. with the Wordsworth Circle* includes 118 letters from the poet or his sister but, as two of these are incomplete, they are here given in full. Broughton's *Wordsworth and Reed* has 22 letters from Wordsworth, one of which is here given in full. Professor de Selincourt says (p. v) that these last volumes contain 1044 letters; I make 1054, of which 4 were incompletely published in earlier volumes of this edition.

In all the *improvements* now going forward [in colleges] . . . a main motive . . . is to acquire influence for political purposes. . . . Medical education . . . is clearly cheap enough. We have far more doctors than can find patients to live by. . . . The better able the parents are to incur expense, the stronger pledge have we of their children being above meanness, and unfeeling and sordid habits. As to teaching Belles Lettres, Languages, Law, Political Economy, Morals, etc., by lectures, it is absurd.²

The letters from Italy, the greater part of which have not been printed before, are likewise distressing reading for those of us who admire the poet. They are filled with complaints of discomforts and inconveniences: fatigue, heat, loneliness, pains and minor illnesses, disappointment in not receiving letters, criticism of his companion (Crabb Robinson), and of his family for offering good advice. All travellers have anxieties and difficulties but most of us, if we mention them at all, make light of them in order to give pleasure, not concern, to our friends. Wordsworth seemed to think only of himself. The general tameness of his letters is due in part to this same cause, his unwillingness or inability to make an effort to be pleasing. When he exerted himself, as in some of his correspondence with Miss Fenwick or when he was roused by interest in a subject, he could write well.

The poet was himself conscious of his faults. In two of the many interesting letters to Miss Fenwick, which are here published for the first time, he wrote: "What I lament most is that the spirituality of my Nature does not expand and rise the nearer I approach the grave . . . no kind of reading interests me as it used to do, and I feel that I am becoming daily a much less instructive Companion to others." "Only assure me that you will not judge of my faults and infirmities so severely . . . I will *endeavour to mend*. . . . I am too conscious my dear Friend that I am unworthy of being always in your sight."³ Seldom did Wordsworth express himself as freely as this, more often he was formal and pedestrian when he should have been spontaneous and friendly. Except with his family he seems to have found it hard to express the kindness that he undoubtedly felt, and in consequence the letters give an inadequate and misleading picture of the man. It is clear from his actions and from the testimony of those who knew him well that he was a more interesting, a more admirable, and a more likable person than these volumes would lead one to suppose. As Crabb Robinson wrote in his diary for November 20, 1820, "he is a still man when he does enjoy himself and by no means ready to talk of his pleasure."

² Letter to Lord Lonsdale of June, 1825. In a letter to his wife of July 17, 1837, he wrote: "How often have I wished for James to assist me about the carriage . . . for nothing can exceed the stupidity of these foreigners."

³ Letters to Miss Fenwick of September 19, 1844 and September-October, 1844. In a letter to his family of July 5, 1837, he spoke contritely of his harshness and "all my unworthiness."

It is hardly necessary to add that these hundreds of pages of previously unpublished material together with the corrections to the text and the dates of what has previously been published offer much that is invaluable to the student of Wordsworth. Aside from the light they throw on the poet's personality, opinions, literary tastes and theories, they are essential to any understanding of his later years,—the importance that eye-trouble played in his life, his absorption in his family and their health, the fading of his intimacy with old friends and the coming of new, who were commonly persons of wealth or of position, and the loss of joy, which is mentioned so early as 1798 (in "Tintern Abbey") and is the subject of much of his verse. It is unfortunate that Professor de Selincourt has been unable to see and thus to print correctly and in full many of the letters Knight published only thirty-two years ago. As forty-three letters have turned up while this edition was passing through the press, more will certainly be found. Several noteworthy letters from the early years are printed for the first time in the appendix to these volumes. One gives us Wordsworth's early impressions of Coleridge and Southey, another shows that Hazlitt's misconduct in the north was apparently not the cause of his quarrel with the lake poets, one praises Keats and another Crabbe. The index covers only the last three volumes, is limited chiefly to proper names, and is not always complete for these.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

The Life of S. T. Coleridge: The Early Years. By LAWRENCE HANSON. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 575. \$5.00.

Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 254. \$4.00.

It is inevitable that Mr. Hanson's biography of Coleridge should be compared with that of Sir Edmund Chambers, which preceded it by a mere matter of weeks. Again and again, in reading Chambers, one felt that an adequate account of Coleridge was simply impossible within so limited a space, and that, although the book was strictly confined to biographical facts, its compression, however masterly it might be, not only precluded full discussion of certain events, but ran the constant risk of false emphasis and consequent lack of proportion.

Mr. Hanson's *Life* is on a larger scale, and he uses an amplitude which Chambers denied himself. The present volume of 575 pages

stops short on June 12, 1800, the day on which Coleridge left Stowey with his family to settle at Greta Hall. He was then barely 28 years old, and, although he had written nearly all the poetry by which he is remembered, the remaining thirty-four years of his life contain plenty to interest a biographer. The tragic story of the decline of his powers and of his struggles against opium is in many ways more fascinating than that of his youthful enthusiasms and indiscretions in the days before his intimacy with Wordsworth began, and the Highgate period, more serene and less eventful, has yet to be fully described. Two, or even three, more volumes will be necessary for the completion of Mr. Hanson's task.

Mr. Hanson's plan rightly includes a consideration of Coleridge's intellectual activities, and of the influences which stimulated his contributions to poetry, criticism, and philosophy. To many chapters 6 and 7, on Wordsworth and his early relations with Coleridge, will prove the most interesting. Coleridge himself divided all thinkers into Platonists and Aristotelians, and scholars, as Lowes once suggested, seem similarly to be divided into Wordsworthians and Coleridgians. Mr. Hanson, it need scarcely be said, is on the side of his hero, and it cannot be expected that the Wordsworthians will agree with everything that he says about the extent of Coleridge's influence on Wordsworth. But though they may disagree they cannot complain; they have had their way for too long, and we have looked at Coleridge's character through their eyes for the better part of fifty years.

Mr. Hanson has many qualities that are excellent in a biographer, and it is to be hoped that he will persevere with his task. He writes with distinction but, whenever possible, he allows Coleridge to speak for himself, and the unobtrusive skill with which Coleridge's character is gradually unfolded is one of the most attractive features of the book. The pace is leisurely, too leisurely perhaps, and one sometimes thinks regretfully of Chambers's terseness and precision. It must be admitted, too, that the account in chapter 10 of the influence on Coleridge of the eighteenth century philosophers, especially of Hartley, is in such general terms as to make one wonder (quite unjustly, I have no doubt) whether Mr. Hanson has read them all, and it is difficult to feel that the criticisms of *The Ancient Mariner*, *Christabel*, and *Kubla Khan* (pp. 253-261) add anything to what has already been said about these poems.

Mr. Hanson is a safe enough guide over much difficult and thorny ground, but it would be unwise to follow him implicitly when he sets out to scale the heights. Further, his sense of the proper marshalling of facts and evidence deserts him occasionally, and in the very places where skill and caution are most necessary. The unexpectedly dogmatic statement that *Christabel*, though "begun after, [was] finished before *The Ancient Mariner*" (p. 256) has, it is true, a footnote, but it cannot be said that the authorities there

referred to justify the assertion. Only when the authorities cited by his authorities have been investigated does it appear that he is proceeding on the exceedingly doubtful assumption that Coleridge alluded to *Christabel* when he wrote to Cottle on February 18, 1798: "I have finished my ballad—it is 340 lines." Elsewhere, in summing up the influences which contributed to the creation of *The Ancient Mariner*, he writes: "The things that had been impressed upon the eye and the mind, by seeing and by reading, were then moulded in dream: 'my Dreams become the Substances of my Life,' said Coleridge. They played a vital part in the final, the subconscious perfecting of *The Ancient Mariner*" (p. 255). But Coleridge's remark is from a letter of 1803, and it introduces a passage from *The Pains of Sleep* which describes some of the horrors of opium addiction. Are we to believe that Mr. Hanson regards *The Ancient Mariner* as the product of opium dreams, and, if so, to what extent? He does not tell us.

The volume collected by E. L. Griggs in honour of Professor Harper of Princeton contains articles on Anna Seward and Henrietta Maria Williams, but the greater part of it consists of esthetic and biographical studies relating to the two poets whose names appear on the title-page. R. D. Havens and O. J. Campbell, who write on "Solitude, Silence, and Loneliness in the Poetry of Wordsworth" and "Wordsworth's Conception of the Esthetic Experience" respectively, approach from different angles what is essentially the same problem, and another related essay, "The Tragic Flaw in Wordsworth's Philosophy" by Newton P. Stallknecht, suggests by implication at least that some of the Wordsworthians will admit that the loss of the stimulus of Coleridge's companionship was a grievous one for him. In "Coleridge on the Sublime" C. D. Thorpe brings together and examines Coleridge's utterances on the subject, of which the most interesting is in a set of definitions printed by Allsop, the original manuscript of which, incidentally, is now in the Cornell University Library. One's only regret about this article is that there was not room to relate Coleridge's definition of the sublime to his theory of imagination.

The biographical studies are all illuminating. Professor de Selincourt analyses the relations between Wordsworth and Edward Quillinan, who became his son-in-law. Miss Edith Morley's article on "Coleridge in Germany," which was based on her examination of the Greenough papers, is reprinted, and scholars will be glad to have it in a more accessible form. The Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge contributes two exceedingly interesting accounts by his great-grandfather of long mountain rambles made in 1799 and 1802, which indicate the nature of some of the materials which Mr. Coleridge has made available to Mr. Hanson and will doubtless enhance the value of the later volumes of his *Life*. The editor's contribution is a critique of *Christabel* by J. J. Morgan, now first printed from

manuscript. Though internal evidence seems to show that Coleridge can hardly have had as much to do with its composition as Professor Griggs would like to believe, it undoubtedly owes much to his conversation and contains an illuminating analysis of the effects which Coleridge was trying to achieve in the poem.

R. C. BALD

Cornell University

Lingua Nostra, Anno I, Febbraio 1939—XVII. Sansoni, Florence.

Cette nouvelle revue comble une lacune qui s'est fait sentir depuis longtemps en Italie: il y avait un organe pour les études historiques de la langue italienne, le vénérable *Archivio glottologico italiano*, et depuis une époque plus récente, un organe pour les études de dialectologie, l'*Italia dialettale*—deux représentants de la linguistique du XIX^e siècle qui s'inspiraient de ce singulier mélange d'historisme et de naturalisme qui caractérise ce siècle: les dialectes seuls, non la langue littéraire, semblaient pouvoir contribuer à l'histoire d'une langue et être 'dignes d'une histoire.' D'une façon générale, il y avait schisme entre la linguistique et l'histoire littéraire, celle-ci traitant la littérature moderne, celle-là traitant la langue ancienne: une œuvre de linguistique 'moderne' comme celle de Brunot n'avait au fond pas de critique compétent. En Italie, De Lollis et Migliorini avaient introduit une linguistique plus proche de l'histoire de la civilisation dans *Cultura*, mais la langue ne trouvait qu'un espace limité dans une revue d'envergure plus large. D'autre part M. Bertoni donnait dans l'*Archivum romanicum* des aperçus de sa philosophie de la langue, s'inspirant à la philosophie de Croce, mais le programme de sa revue, plutôt dédiée au médiévisme et parallèle à la *Romania* française, ne pouvait trop s'occuper des phénomènes modernes de l'italien. Croce lui-même dans sa *Critica*, tout grand inspirateur de la linguistique qu'il soit, et adonné qu'il est à la distinction esthétique de *poesia e non poesia*, n'a jamais montré de l'intérêt pour le microscopisme de la linguistique. Dans tous les pays, on commence à être las du passéisme et à s'intéresser davantage à l'investigation linguistique des évolutions modernes—et ce n'est que justice si, à côté de la revue si bien rédigée de M. Dauzat, *Le français moderne*, et de la moins bien rédigée *Muttersprache* allemande, se place maintenant l'organe italien, dirigé par le romanisant B. Migliorini, l'auteur renommé de l'excellent livre "*Lingua contemporanea*," venant de rentrer en Italie et occuper une chaire à Florence qui lui permettra de faire rayonner son talent, et le classicisant M. Devoto, connu par ses études de syntaxe latine. Evidemment, à une époque où toute

la civilisation évolue et dans un pays où on accentue le côté *volontariste* du développement de la civilisation, les problèmes posés par celle-ci à la langue sont plus nombreux et peuvent être résolus par le concours de savants experts en linguistique aussi bien qu'ouverts aux questions actuelles: *faire de l'histoire* peut aussi bien tenter les savants que l'étudier. On remarquera que le livre de M. Migliorini porte, ainsi que la revue de Dauzat, un titre moins affectif que le nouveau périodique: "contemporain" n'inclut pas la nuance patriotique du possessif "nostra": c'est que les éditeurs comptent évidemment avec la résonance du grand public et aussi avec la bonne volonté des autorités fascistes. Je pourrais m'imaginer que des conflits entre la science des historiens du langage et de la politique des gouvernants pourraient naître, que souvent ceux-là devront tout simplement obéir à ceux-ci (on aimerait p. ex. savoir ce que pensent des linguistes du nouveau règlement *ex officio* du pronom allocutoire italien), mais il faut dire loyalement que dans le numéro-spécimen les exigences de la science ne sont pas du tout sacrifiées, que les tendances à réformer la langue cadrent avec la saine raison et que les articles scientifiques, qui portent quelquefois sur des problèmes purement historiques, apportent du nouveau. On remarquera un article suggestif de M. Migliorini sur les courants savant et populaire en italien (avec le vœu fermement exprimé de ne céder en fait de néologismes ni à l'attitude "tour d'ivoire" ni au "plébésisme"), et un article de MM. Bertoni et Ugolini sur "l'axe Rome-Florence" dans la langue italienne (avec le désir de concilier les prononciations de ces deux métropoles de l'italien avec les raisons historiques tirées du latin)—pourquoi d'ailleurs dire *axes* au lieu de pôles?

Pour *editoriale* (p. 32) que M. Migliorini voudrait remplacer par *direttoriale*, il faudrait noter que l'*editorial* américain n'est pas du tout identique avec l'*article de fond*, *leader*, *Leitartikel*, tel qu'il est en usage sur le continent européen: les journaux américains offrent en première page les nouvelles "les plus nouvelles" et n'ont pas d'article de fond en tête du numéro. Les *editorials* sont des gloses plus ou moins courtes du jour, pas signées mais exprimant les idées de la direction, à l'intérieur (au milieu) du numéro. Je me rappelle que p. ex. la *Frankfurter Zeitung* a introduit les *editorials* ou gloses-commentaires seulement au moment de sa mise au pas avec l'hitlérisme et laisse subsister l'article de fond à côté de cette innovation due au renforcement de la propagande. En France l'*editorial* est identique au *leader*, v. Georges Weill, "Le Journal" (1934), p. 320: "En première page, l'*editorial* et le "leader" prirent un grand développement."

L'article de M. G. Pasquali sur *in casa i Frescobaldi* relève bien le fait que ces restes italiens du cas oblique, plus développé en galloroman, sont attestés seulement pour des noms propres (a. it. *la Dio mercè*, qu'on pourrait ajouter, rentre dans la même catégorie) et que l'italien se refuse au type syntaxique moderne de l'"étiquette" ("cartello"): *loggia dei Lanzi*, non pas *via Cavour*, est l'expression autochtone. Je crois en effet que des cas anc. ital. comme *fi' Giovanni*, *lo di San Vito*, *la Dio mercè*, *il porco San Antonio* etc., tout dérivés qu'ils sont de génitifs ou de possessifs latino-romans (v. les exemples de génitif latin qui précèdent cette con-

struction au § 438 du "prospetto grammaticale" de la *Crestomazia* de Monaci: *figiastro Bonfantini, servi sancte Marie* etc.), trahissent une nouvelle conception ancienne romane vis-à-vis de la personnalité: c'est celle qui consiste à ne pas transformer un nom propre, entouré de la révérence qui lui est due, par la flexion: la *Dio* mercè conserve un *Dio* non altéré par les nécessités syntaxiques (la forme phonétique réfractaire au système de flexion roman de certains noms bibliques aura contribué à cette immobilité du nom propre qui s'observe déjà dans la Vulgate: *fili Israel*, sous l'influence hébraïque). M. Foulet a noté le même ton noble du type *la fille le roi* dans sa *Petite Syntaxe de l'anc. fr.*—mais le système flexionnel italien (qui en général ne connaît pas l'alternance cas-sujet—cas-régime) a créé quelque chose de nouveau, qui s'oppose aussi bien au système latin qu'à celui du galloroman: l'inaltérabilité du nom propre. Bien entendu, les étiquettes syntaxiques du français moderne (*affaire Dreyfus*, *rue Bonaparte*) et des autres langues qui ont imité le tour français, procèdent d'une autre conception de la personnalité et du nom propre: précisément de la dépersonnalisation moderne du nom propre, qui devient un en-tête de fiche. Le *status constructus* du nom propre en anc. ital. est donc un fait particulier de cette époque de la langue qui mérite d'être relevé: il est d'ailleurs en harmonie avec l'attitude de respect du roman ancien pour le nom propre qui se trahit aussi dans le manque d'article, plus général dans les anciennes langues que dans les modernes.—Je crois que l'explication du manque de la préposition *in* dans le fr. *chez* (alors que l'anc. ital. a *in casa* i *Frescobaldi*) ne sera pas l'acc. *domum* dans *domum vado* (auquel un **casam* aurait succédé): *chez* ne s'emploie pas seulement avec les verbes de mouvement. M. P. est devenu hésitant lui-même en pensant à l'a. fr. *lez* = *latus*. Or, M. Löfstedt dans son *Philolog. Kommentar* etc. a attesté un *latus se* 'à côté de soi' dès la *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* et a rappelé que la préposition latine *circum* n'a pas d'autre origine que l'acc. d'un substantif. La "prépositionalisation" d'un substantif est donc dans la tradition latine. Cf. aussi El. Richter, *ZRPh*, xxxi, 572 sur le "absoluter Ablativ der Ruhelage" en latin (*theatro* = 'au théâtre'). On trouvera là aussi les locutions a. fr. *a*, en *ches*, a. port. *a*, em *cas*, de sorte que l'italien ne se distingue que par l'absence du masculin **casus*, qui, de son côté, pourrait s'expliquer par l'absence de *mansus* en Italie. Je me demande si l'autonomie plus grande de *casa* dans l'ital. *in casa* i *Frescobaldi* vis-à-vis du fr. *chez Dupont* tout à fait prépositionalisé, ne tient pas au fait que la maison de la commune italienne était une entité plus concrète représentant davantage la famille que la maison française: M. G. Serra dans son livre "Continuità nel medioevo delle comunità rurali romane e preromane dell'Italia superiore," p. 69, indique que l'ital. *casato* 'tutte le famiglie discese dal medesimo stipite,' 'nome di famiglia' etc. indique une correspondance "fra l'unità agnatzia di più famiglie e l'unità materiale della dimora comune": l'expression *in casa* i *Frescobaldi* évoque la famille des F. résidant dans 'sa' maison, et d'ailleurs ce pluriel collectif i *Frescobaldi* indique "la comunione di diritti, di sangue e di dimora fra i membri del gruppo gentilizio" (Serra, *loc. cit.*, p. 73 et aussi dans son article *Dacoromania* III, 523: "Per la storia del cognome italiano," où il cite la phrase de Gaudenzi: "La storia del cognome è . . . per un certo rispetto la storia della famiglia"). Le fr. *chez Dupont* signifie plutôt 'dans la maison d'un seul personnage, Dupont,' parce que la *chaise* (= *casa*) est en a. fr. 'le vol du chapon, les quatre arpents de terre autour du château qui sont assurés au fils aîné comme héritage' (Richter, *loc. cit.*), la *casa italiana* est plutôt la demeure d'une collectivité.

La Correspondance de Diderot. By LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR.
New York: The Kingsley Press, 1939. Pp. 120.

Diderot's correspondence has never been the subject of a special and thorough study. K. attempts to supply this long-felt want which, as he points out, is rendered more urgent by the recent publication of André Babelon,¹ which has brought to light a number of new facts concerning Diderot. In his first chapter K. shows how Diderot's correspondence—particularly the recently published letters—enables us to enrich, deepen, and correct some aspects of Diderot's "personnalité morale et intellectuelle," for example the bourgeois character of Diderot, his cunning business sense, his sociability, his sincerity, his "mobilité d'humeur et mobilité d'esprit," the romantic aspects of his nature, some general characteristics of his thought, such as the undisciplined profuseness of his ideas, the largeness of his mind, his enthusiasm, his pessimism, etc. The second chapter seeks to cast a new light on certain problems concerning Diderot's thought, his political ideas, his evolution towards atheism and materialism, his conception of the relationship between morals and religion, between freedom and determinism. Above all K. tries to establish, by means of the correspondence, a more exact chronology of the development of Diderot's ideas (see also Appendix I). Chapter III deals with the correspondence as an *œuvre littéraire*. It contains general remarks on Diderot's style, a too brief enumeration of his forms of expression, and a comparison of Diderot's letters with examples of epistolary form by outstanding letter-writers of the eighteenth century. As a post-script to this chapter the author discusses the correspondence as a "document personnel" and as a "document social." Appendix II deals briefly with Diderot's relationship to his brother. Appendix III corrects certain mistakes made by Babelon in his edition of Diderot's correspondence.

The author would have accomplished his task much more satisfactorily, had he possessed a more exact knowledge of Diderot's works and of the studies devoted to him. His critical remarks on Babelon's edition as well as the demonstration that some themes of Diderot's thought can be dated, by means of the correspondence, earlier than they have been up to now, would have been new if published several years ago. A few observations: as K. attaches great importance to exact chronology, he should have mentioned the fact that numerous *inédits* of the correspondence between Diderot and Sophie Volland were known as early as 1925 (Paul Ledieu: *Diderot et Sophie Volland*). K. is not the first to accuse Diderot of "roublardise." The controversy on this subject is old and does not gain by its new form, particularly since K. distorts

¹ *Denis Diderot: Lettres à Sophie Volland.* Publ. par André Babelon, 3 vol. Paris, 1930. *Denis Diderot: Correspondance inédite.* Publ. par A. Babelon, 2 vol. Paris, 1931.

Diderot's texts. The same is true of K.'s objections to Diderot's "franchise." When K. writes:

Le XVIII^e siècle fut moins un siècle de philosophes que de propagandistes; ceux qu'on appelaient (*sic*) "philosophes" n'étaient pas tant des penseurs profonds s'intéressant à la vérité abstraite, que des vulgarisateurs cherchant à répandre des idées opposées à ce qu'ils considéraient comme des préjugés ou des abus (p. 17),

we understand why his discussion of Diderot's evolution towards materialism and atheism is so unsatisfactory. To see in eighteenth century philosophy only a work of vulgarization is a dangerous simplification which makes the understanding of its great themes impossible.² Why does K. constantly try to establish a chronology of Diderot's ideas, only to contradict himself by stating that *all* problems interested Diderot at the very same moment? Attempts to establish a chronological evolution of Diderot's thought have always failed, because they spring from a false comprehension of his very nature. There are more important problems concerning Diderot to be solved than the century-old discussion of his evolution towards atheism and materialism.

The author of these lines finds it impossible to enter into further details, since K.'s reasoning seems to him a rather vague basis for a sound discussion. He does not believe that K.'s study of Diderot's correspondence is the one which the author promised to give and which we greatly need. A more exact knowledge of Diderot's works, of the studies concerning these works, and of the eighteenth century would have been desirable as well as a more delicate and expert sense of style.

HERBERT DIECKMANN

Washington University

The Literature of Slang. By W.[ILLIAM] J.[EREMIAH] BURKE.
With an Introductory Note by ERIC PARTRIDGE. New York:
The New York Public Library, 1939. vii + 180 pp.

Mr. Burke's bibliography *The Literature of Slang* is without question an indispensable handbook for libraries and students of unconventional English, for it brings together many references which have appeared since Arthur G. Kennedy's *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language* was compiled. On the other hand the form in which this new bibliography is presented leaves much to be desired.

² How complex and rich the problem of the relationship between "vulgari-
sation" and "philosophie" in the eighteenth century really is can be seen
in the study of Fritz Schalk: *Einleitung in die Encyclopädie der französi-
schen Aufklärung*. München, 1936.

Mr. Burke might well have stated in his preface just what he intended to do. For example this bibliography includes Americanisms and dialect, but the only statement to that effect appears in Mr. Partridge's introduction. Accompanying nearly every entry there are certain code letters for which there is no explanation. Possibly they are intelligible to the staff of the New York Public Library, for Mr. Burke's work was reprinted from various numbers of the *New York Public Library* (1936-1938). In its present form the bibliography is divided into ten sections which are listed in a table of contents. No subjects are given in the index; consequently these ten "chapter" headings are the sole means of locating any particular phase of slang. At the beginning of each section the heading given in the table of contents is subdivided, in one case into forty-two subjects. Should one wish to look up references to articles on Quick Lunch, Soda Fountain, or Aquarium slang, it is first necessary to know that these are occupations and then leaf through the pages of that section until the desired topic turns up.

The index, which lists authors only, differs from the usual run of indexes in that it gives a short title under the author's names. These short titles, however, can be very misleading; for if an author has compiled various magazine articles into one book, only the title of the book is given, and one must dig through Mr. Burke's note on that book for reference to the individual article. (Cf. Bowen, Edwin Winfield, p. 36). Another phase of this faulty indexing appears under the entry for A. G. Empey (p. 127). Only one of his books appears under the author's name in the index, but another is mentioned in Mr. Burke's note to the first. Although there are numerous entries under Pierce Egan in the index, his edition of Grose's *Vulgar Tongue* is not among them and can be located only by guessing that it must be traced through Grose.

On Mr. Burke's own admission (p. 158) "authors mentioned in the notes are not indexed." Needless to say these references are lost and yet they include such items as "David Humphrey's glossary of Americanisms, which appeared in the back of his play *The Yankey in England*, 1815" (p. 14 under Mathews, Mitford McLeod.) It is probable that no less than half of the names mentioned in this bibliography are buried in the notes.

Besides these mechanical defects there are numerous errors and omissions throughout the bibliography. *American Speech* is listed as a separate entry but *Dialect Notes* is not, even though its various articles are included. There seems to be no mention of *American Literature*. Under Thornton's *An American Glossary* (p. 10), Mr. Burke refers to the *Historical dictionary of the American language* and yet on another page (p. 4) he gives its correct title: *A dictionary of American English on historical principles*. Mr. Burke gives two references from *Harper's bazar* under Higginson (p. 33) but his note on this author says "Higginson conducted a column . . . in *Harper's bazar*, and many of his articles are devoted to slang,

dialect, and speech problems." Kennedy gives three of Higginson's articles which are not included by Burke (K—1894, 11450, 11909). Mr. Burke says of the one-volume edition of Farmer and Henley, *Slang and its analogues* . . . (p. 5) "The abridged edition published by E. P. Dutton & Co. was reviewed . . . 1922." This would seem to imply that the work appeared about that time. Actually it was published in 1905 by Geo. Routledge & Sons in London. Basil Hargrave's *Origin and meanings of popular phrases & names* is listed (p. 6) but the 1925 edition of this work which includes "those which came into use during the great war" is omitted. Mr. Burke in his preface makes acknowledgment of his indebtedness to various people but in small type under the entry for A. G. Kennedy's *A bibliography of writings on the English language* . . . (p. 61) is the remark "This is the standard authority on the English language, and the compiler makes acknowledgment for the help it has afforded him." This might well have appeared in the preface.

A bibliography is useful in the degree to which it serves its purpose. Mr. Burke's *The Literature of Slang* misses its objective by the lack of a good index—the material is there if you can find it.

J. LOUIS KUETHE

The Johns Hopkins University Library

Two Bookes of Constancie Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius. Englished by Sir John Stradling. Edited with an Introduction by RUDOLPH KIRK. Notes by CLAYTON MORRIS HALL. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 224. \$4.50.

In this second publication of the Rutgers English series, the student of the Renaissance has one of the more important documents of sixteenth century Christian stoicism in a form that he will find more easy to read than the original text of the *De Constantia*. While the scholar would prefer a modern translation of Lipsius' treatise, Stradling's translation is, however, more faithful to the thought and letter of the original than the usual translation of the Tudor age.

To the reprint of Stradling's text, Professor Kirk has prefixed a biographical account of Lipsius drawn from those of Nisard, Zanta, and others; a short notice on the English translations of stoic sources; a statement of Lipsius' deviations from the creed of classical stoicism; and a summary of the text. A thorough student of Lipsius' life and writings might quarrel with some of the points in the biography, but it would be a quarrel with Professor Kirk's authorities and not with Professor Kirk. He might also emend

Professor Kirk's lists of vernacular editions of the stoics by observing that the first Dutch translation of Epictetus came in 1564 and not in 1615, that the same author was in Italian in 1551, that Seneca was in French before 1578 and in Italian long before 1717. But these are small points and of interest only to minute scholarship.

One can make similar observations about Professor Kirk's further essays. There is no doubt that his discussion of Lipsius' variants on the stoic theme would have been enhanced by a study of Lipsius' more formal treatments of the sect, by a consideration of the *Manuductio ad Stoicam Philosophiam* and the *Physiologia Stoicorum*. These works supply the spine to the *De Constantia*; they are what Zeller is to Durant. If this section of Professor Kirk's introduction indicates anything, it is the thinness of our knowledge of sixteenth century philosophies. A discussion of free will, for example, cannot be made on the basis of one Renaissance philosopher against the classics. Such a discussion can be of value only when the minds of many men are sifted. Pontano, Ficino, Alberti, and Pico della Mirandola had strangely different notions on this question and yet their milieu is essentially the same. Professor Kirk's discussion becomes then a challenge to restudy the movements of ancient systems as they filtered through the minds of Renaissance men, and in that respect it is a very useful piece of writing.

In conclusion, one must say a few words about Mr. Hall's notes. Lipsius, like all scholars of his period, studded his margins with the names of authorities, and Mr. Hall has put himself to infinite pains to identify the exact source of all these references. He has even tracked down the blind references that occurred in the text. Such a labor not only is beneficial to the reader, but enables one to gauge the breadth of Lipsius' reading and his method of utilizing what he read.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

Nicholas Udall's Roister Doister. Edited by G. SCHEURWEGHS.

Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, Vol. xvi.
Louvain: Ch. Uystpruyst, 1939. Pp. lxxxiv + 132.

It is always good to see an old friend newly attired, and this edition of *Roister Doister* is certainly the most elaborate and impressive that has as yet appeared. It forms the first volume of a projected study of Udall which will include editions of the *Floures*, the translations from Erasmus, and an attempt to identify Udall's *comoediae plures*.

Perhaps the most impressive part of the volume is the biographical introduction, for which Dr. Scheurweghs has obviously spent months of patient research in the Public Record Office and in the various

episcopal registers and collegiate record-books of the sixteenth century. While it is true that the general outlines of Udall's life are not radically altered from older accounts such as Flügel's, many interesting details—too numerous to be cited here—are added and sources quoted in full. It is not pleasant to learn that Udall was ousted from his mastership at Eton for homosexuality, but it is pleasant to have unexpurgated documentation (p. xxiv). After a careful discussion of the classical sources and the English literary relations, an elaborate argument for a date between 1545 and 1552 is given; then the text of the unique Eton quarto is reproduced exactly, with ordinary roman used for the original semi-blackletter. The annotation builds effectively on the comments of previous editors and Dr. Scheurweghs casts considerable light on matters of liturgical and ecclesiastical nature, e. g., the mock requiem in lines 969 ff., details of which were misunderstood by previous editors.

A comment may be in order on the occurrence in the Eton quarto of the "puzzling" ligature *ée* which "is used generally for all originally long *e* sounds" (p. 90). Frank Isaac in his *English Printers' Types of the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford Press, 1936), pp. 36-37, says: "The most popular textura (i. e. the semi-blackletter, twenty lines of which measure about 82 mm., used by most printers including the greatest of them—John Day) was the 82 . . . more ligatures were added, the most noticeable being the *ee* with an accent on the first *e*." I conjecture that the fount was almost certainly brought in from abroad (perhaps actual matrices were imported) and the letter cast at some common source in England. If the type came from the low countries, a ligature *ée* would be most useful, especially in printing French. As to the form: it was not unusual to start out with a character *â*, file it down to *á*, and wind up with *a*. Perhaps then the ligature *ée* was intended to be filed down to *ee* but no one got around to doing it. Dr. Scheurweghs apparently rejects the conjecture of the *Short Title Catalogue* that the probable printer of the unique Eton copy, which lacks a title-page, was Henry Denham, since he refers to "the printer" throughout. But in Denham's edition of John Marbecke's prose *The Lyues of holy Sainctes* (1574), which Dr. C. F. Bühler of the Pierpont Morgan Library has kindly examined for me, the following forms are found: *séeing*, *mée*, *kéepe*, *dée*, *hée*, and even in *Bethléem*, where the ligature doubtless stands for a diaeresis. It is similarly used in Day's first edition of Ascham's *Scholemaster* (1570). Therefore I do not think that the accent mark was deemed to have any phonetic value; the printer simply used the only ligature that he had, i. e., *ée*, whenever he found double *e* in his copy. The two instances of plain ligature without accent on line 321 and 432 of *Roister Doister* would then have to be explained as two types which had been filed down or as two instances when the ink made no impress.

There are a few blemishes. It is awkward (p. xxxix) to say that

"he composed an answer to the Rebels of Cornwall and Devonshire" and then contradict this by stating a few lines further that "the answer, however, is not Udall's, but Philip Nichol's"; and there are a few misprints: on p. lxxviii *for* disponal *read* disposal, on p. 101 *for* mens *read* meus, on p. 109 *read* Catholic rites, and it should be C. M. Gayley on p. lxxxiii and p. 130. But these are unimportant matters; all students of our earlier drama must remain greatly indebted to Dr. Scheurweghs for his splendid work.

R. H. BOWERS

St. Petersburg Junior College

BRIEF MENTION

Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance. By ERWIN PANOFSKY. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxxiii + 262. \$3.50. The six studies contained in this handsome volume were delivered as the Mary Flexner lectures at Bryn Mawr College in 1937. Though they were not entirely unpublished even at that date, their present appearance in print is welcome in view of their former relative inaccessability to the American public and their now beautiful and copious illustration. As usual, Professor Panofsky's work touches on several fields of interest and on mediums of expression other than those of the figurative arts. With extraordinary range of reference and synthesis, the essays on *Father Time*, on *Blind Cupid*, on the *Neoplatonic Movement in Florence and North Italy* and on the *Neoplatonic Movement and Michelangelo* elucidate, through examination of various "icons," cultural and creative interplays and trends from Classical times to the late Renaissance in ways of decided interest for any historian of almost any aspect of European culture over that long period. The historian of ideas will certainly be very directly concerned with these studies, and in the second essay on the *Early History of Man* will find a considerable contribution to the study of Primitivism. It is especially the introductory essay of this volume which deserves the close attention of the historian and critic of art in the medium of words. Here is a statement of methodology which one would like to find at the front of every history of literature. In terms of *object*, *act* and *controlling principle of interpretation* as well as *equipment for interpretation*, Professor Panofsky leaves no doubt whatever as to the basis, range and goal of his science. The object of that science lends itself to three

spheres of meaning which are here clearly defined. These meanings are in no large way new even to the literary historian. Yet one wonders if the latter has as yet attained the basic theoretical statement of his methodology in terms which can stand or fall beside those of Panofsky for Iconology? Certainly it can be safely said that the historian of literary art too often fails to include in his "equipment for interpretation" the equivalent of Panofsky's "knowledge of literary sources"; namely: a *knowledge of iconographical sources*.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

Johnsonian Gleanings: Part IX, A Further Miscellany. By ALEYN LYELL READE. Privately Printed (Treleaven House, Blundellsands near Liverpool), 1939. Pp. iv + 282. 21 s. We had come to think of Mr. Reade's pleasant *Gleanings* as planned on Sterne's generous scale: if not two volumes a year, at least one in two years, indefinitely. But it appears that the series is really coming to an end. Part X will be "a straightforward account of Johnson's life down to 1740" and Part XI will be a consolidated index. The present volume collects and dismisses with rueful humor all the genealogical problems which Mr. Reade has been holding back in the hope that he would ultimately arrive at complete solutions. The greater part of it is to be consulted rather than read, but all Johnsonians will be entertained and enlightened by the chapter on Parson Ford, and by the full account of Johnson's efforts, at the end of his life, to assist his relatives, the Misses Collier, in obtaining their inheritance from their step-father, Mr. Flint. Mr. Reade confesses with deep contrition his inability to tell us how the Misses Collier were related to the Doctor, and he does not know whether or not they ever got justice, but he has no difficulty in demonstrating Johnson's humanity. It is a pleasure beyond the bounds of expectation to be able to amplify one of his genealogies. The cousinship which Boswell claimed with Capt. William Maxwell of Dalswinton was fairly close, Capt. Maxwell's mother and Boswell being first cousins of the half blood. I have sent Mr. Reade a "narrative pedigree."

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

New Haven, Connecticut

CORRESPONDENCE

CHAUCER'S MONK. In the May number of *MLN*. (pp. 350 ff.) Professor Tatlock makes two statements in his discussion of Chaucer's Monk that perhaps are open to question. The bearing on his main point must for the present be postponed. First, Tatlock says "no medieval would use 'Monk' of an Augustinian canon." According to the *NED*. ("Canon"), however, "... the difference between *canon regular* (i.e. Augustinian) and a *monk*, became in the later Middle Ages (as now in the R. C. Ch.) so slight that the one is frequently confused with the other." Moreover the *NED* cites Littré: "Thus Littré explains Augustinian Canons as '*moines*, dits aussi hermites de Saint-Augustin'." With this statement may also be compared the *Cath. Ency.* ("Monk"). Secondly, Tatlock remarks that St. Edward the Confessor "was not a specially prominent saint in the fourteenth century." Evidence, at least in the reign of Richard II and therefore pertinent to our discussion, points to the contrary. At his coronation King Richard solemnly swore "to grant and keep . . . the laws and customs granted by the ancient kings of England . . . ; and namely the laws . . . granted . . . by the glorious king Saint Edward." The next year (1378) church and state openly clashed as a result of the murder of John Hawley at the base of the Confessor's shrine; the King was represented at the next meeting of Parliament by none other than Wycliffe. Saint Edward was a rallying point for the King in the Peasants Revolt of 1381. Before going to Smithfield to quell the mob Richard first went to the shrine of the Confessor, "where he knelt long in prayer." Richard II, according to Dean Stanley (I, 176), removed the grandchildren of Edward I "from their place in the Confessor's Chapel . . . and on the vacant site thus secured was raised the tomb for his wife, Anne of Bohemia." Even the Irish, according to Froissart writing the following year, "loued and dredde hym (i.e. St. Edward) moche more than any other kyng of Englande that had been before." Capitalizing on this King Richard in 1394 while in Ireland "lefte the beryng of the armes of Englande . . . and bare the armes of thys saynt Edward . . . : whereof it was said the yrisshmen were well pleased, and the soner they enclyned to hym . . ." The Confessor, remarks Froissart, is "honoured through all this realm." The contemporary Wilton Diptych in the National Portrait Gallery depicts King Richard being introduced to the "Blessed Virgin with the Child, accompanied by her Court of Angels," by Saint John the Baptist, Saint Edmund, and St. Edward the Confessor. The importance of the Confessor as a national saint in the time of the *Canterbury Tales* can further be inferred from what took place in 1397: in this year temporal and spiritual peers of Parliament swore upon the shrine of the Confessor that they would "never suffer the judgements, statutes, and ordinances of that year to be revoked." Henry IV was crowned on Saint Edward's day, and his last prayers were said at the saint's shrine. But—a matter for another time—King Henry was buried opposite another national saint, Thomas Becket.

E. P. KUHLMAN

State University of Iowa

AS BY THE WHELP CHASTISED IS THE LEON. In *MLN.* LV (1940), 209-10, Mr. C. S. Brown and Mr. R. H. West suggest that in using this expression in the *Squire's Tale* Chaucer "was referring to a matter of common knowledge and possibly current practice, rather than to a learned proverb of obscure origin," since "lion tamers of the 13th century apparently did beat dogs in order to intimidate their pets." But this proverb is less learned and of less obscure origin than they assume. It was long ago connected with the animal trainer's arts, and both proverb and practice were widely cited before Chaucer's day. The saying appears first in St. Ambrose in the 4th century: *Caeditur canis, ut pavescat leo*. Egbert of Liège in his popular *Fecunda Ratis* refers to it in the early 11th century as: *Ceditur, ut feritas paveat, canis ante leonem*. Another Latin form of a little later day is: *Percutitur sepe canis, ut timeat leo fortis*. By the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century we find it in a French version of *Aesopus*: *Por l'orguil dou lyon rabatre, / Fait l'on le chin devant lui batre*. A MS of ca. 1317 reads: *Por donter, bat on le chien devant le lyon*. And in *Les Diz et Proverbes des Sages*, written about the year that Chaucer was born, we have: *A la foiz avient que li hom / Bat le chien devant le lyon*. Of this immensely popular work some thirty MSS survive. In English the proverb appears as: *By the litul welyps me chastys þe lyon*.¹ So much for the proverb. References to the practice and illustrations of it had also become traditional. Thomas de Cantimpré, Albertus Magnus and Vincent of Beauvais allude to it in Latin, Lambert d'Ardre, Villard de Honnecourt and others in French. Various representations of it are discussed by Johannes Bolte. Röhrich mentions a similar proverb in Arabic: *If you strike the dog, the ounce will behave*. Now with so much evidence for the early and widespread popularity of the theme it hardly seems likely that the English Chaucer was much concerned with the actual art of the lion tamer when he used this expression, any more than was Shakespeare when Iago says (*Othello* II, 3): *Even so as one would beat his defenseless dog to affright an imperious lion*.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

¹The English version is in a 15th century MS, but its editor believes because of the language that the scribe was copying an earlier collection, perhaps of the 14th century. See Max Foerster, "Die mittenglische Sprichwörterammlung in Douce 52," *Festschrift zum XII. allgemeinen Deutschen Neuphilologentage in München, 1906*, Erlangen, 1906, p. 49, no. 63. A convenient bibliography for the study of this proverb is in Archer Taylor, "An Index to 'The Proverb'," *FF Communications*, No. 113, Helsinki, 1934, p. 28. A picture of the lion-tamer and further references will be found in *Proverbes en Rimes* (ed. Frank and Miner), Plate CLVII and notes to 1255-6.

BAUDELAIRE AND BANDY. In a note entitled "A self-estimate by Baudelaire" (*MLN*, LV, 297-8), Mr. W. T. Bandy cites two passages one from *Le magasin des familles* (June, 1850) and another from *Le messenger de l'assemblée* (April 9, 1851) both of which were known. (Cf. *Œuvres complètes*, éd. Nouv. Rev. Fr., II, 162-63.) He maintains that all editors of *Les fleurs du mal* assumed that the first note was added by Léo Lespès, concludes from the similarity of the two notes that Baudelaire must have written them himself, and makes the point that, if this is true, we have here "one of the earliest recorded appraisals by Baudelaire of his own work." There is no objection to publishing a blurb as a serviceable document, but assumptions and deductions are risky based on such slight evidence. First, it is not true that all editors have assumed that the first note is from Léo Lespès' pen. Mr. Bandy can refer to one of our best scholarly editions of Baudelaire's works cited above. Secondly, the note from *Le messenger* which Mr. Bandy publishes for his argument sounds like a piece of advertising; it incorporates the first but with a significant change: "agitations spirituelles." No process of thought can determine who wrote it. Baudelaire's attitude on such matters is clearly indicated in a letter addressed to Antonio Watrison from which I quote a pertinent passage:

Vous pourrez ajouter à cela: *Physiologie du rire*, qui paraîtra, prochainement, à la *Revue de Paris*, sans doute, ainsi que: *Salon des Caricaturistes*, et *Les Limbes, poésies*, chez Michel Lévy. Ce ne sera pas un mensonge, puisque cela va paraître très-prochainement, et sans doute avant le volume de biographie. Mais tout ceci me semble bien vaniteux. Arrangez, supprimez, faites ce que vous voudrez. Si j'ai oublié quelque chose, tant pis. (*Œuvres complètes*, ed. cit., VII, 61.)

In conclusion, I should be inclined to say that both blurbs, as they are extremely trite, smack of routine advertising, that they have documentary value, but no value, from the evidence we have, so far as Baudelaire's self-criticism is concerned, and that their documentary significance was utilized several years ago.

EMILE MALAKIS

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Bacon.—Essais. Traduits, avec une introduction, par Maurice Castelain. *Paris*: Aubier, 1940. Pp. xlii + 312. 30 fr. (Collection Bilingue des Classiques Anglais.)

Ballads and Songs.—Coll. Missouri Folk-Lore Society. Ed. H. M. Belden. *Columbia, Missouri*: U. of Mo. Press, 1940. Pp. xx + 530. \$1.25. (University of Missouri Studies, XV, 1.)

Boas, Frederick S.—Christopher Marlowe, a biographical and critical study. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1940. Pp. xii + 336. \$4.50.

Bronson, B. H., Caldwell, J. R., Cline, J. M., McKenzie, Gordon, and Ross, J. F.—Five studies in literature. *Berkeley, Calif.*: U. of Calif. Press, 1940. Pp. vi + 153. \$1.50. (U. of Calif. Pubs. in English, Vol. 8, 1.) ["Chaucer's art in relation to his audience," "Hamlet: dramatist," "Hydriotaphia," "Swift: reason and some of its consequences," and "Beauty is truth."]

Buck, Philo M., Jr.—An anthology of world literature. (Revised edition.) *New York*: Macmillan, 1940. Pp. xvi + 1148. \$4.00.

Dahl, Ivar.—Substantial inflexion in early Old English, vocalic stems. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1938. Pp. xvi + 206. 10 Kr. (Lund Studies in English, vii.)

Dialect Notes, Vol. vi, Part xix.—Ed. Miles L. Hanley. *New Haven, Conn.*: American Dialect Society, 1939. Pp. 44. \$1.00.

Engblom, Victor.—On the origin and early development of the auxiliary *Do*. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1938. Pp. 169. 8 Kr. (Lund Studies in English, vi.)

Frenz, Horst.—Die entwicklung des sozialen dramas in England vor Galsworthy. *Bleicherode am Harz*: Carl Nieft, 1938. Pp. 69.

Hutson, Arthur E.—British personal names in the *Historia Regum Britanniae*. *Berkeley, Calif.*: U. of Calif. Press, 1940. Pp. iv + 160. \$1.50. (U. of Calif. Pubs. in English, Vol. 5, 1.)

Irving, William H.—John Gay, favorite of the wits. *Durham, N. C.*: Duke U. Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 334. \$3.50.

Jenkins, Romilly.—Dionysius Solomós. *Cambridge*: University Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 225. \$2.25.

Kruisinga, E.—An introduction to the

study of English sounds. Seventh edition. *Groningen, Batavia*: Noordhoff, 1940. Pp. 218. f. 2.50.

Lowery, Margaret R.—Windows of the morning, a critical study of William Blake's *Poetical Sketches*, 1783. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 249. \$3.00. (Yale Studies in English, 93.)

Rich, Townsend.—Harington and Ariosto, a study in Elizabethan verse translation. *New Haven, Conn.*: Yale U. Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 231. \$2.00. (Yale Studies in English, 92.)

Sherwin, Reider T.—The Viking and the Red Man, the Old Norse origin of the Algonquin language. *New York*: Funk and Wagnalls, 1940. Pp. xxvi + 340. \$2.50.

Ström, Hilmer.—Old English personal names in Bede's History, an etymological-phonological investigation. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1939. Pp. xiv + 180. 10 Kr. (Lund Studies in English, viii.)

Temple, William.—The genius of English poetry. The English Association Presidential Address, 1939. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. Pp. 15. \$0.75.

Workman, Samuel K.—Fifteenth century translation as an influence on English prose. *Princeton, N. J.*: Princeton U. Press, 1940. Pp. x + 210. \$2.00. (Princeton Studies in English, 18.)

Wright, Louis B.—The first gentlemen of Virginia, intellectual qualities of the early colonial ruling class. *San Marino, Calif.*: Huntington Library, 1940. Pp. xii + 373. \$3.75.

GERMAN

Ackerknecht, Erwin.—Gottfried Keller. Geschichte seines Lebens. Mit 16 Bildtafeln. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verl. 1939. 386 pp. M. 8.50.

Allgöwer, Walther.—Gemeinschaft, Vaterland und Staat im Werk Hölderlins. Diss. Basel. *Frauenfeld*: Huber, 1939. 171 pp.

Brandt, Gustav-Adolf.—Herder und Görres. 1798-1807. Ein Beitrag zur Frage Herder und die Romantik. Diss. Berlin. [Stadion, Bd. 3]. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1938. 71 pp. M. 2.40.

Brentano, Clemens.—Das unsterbliche Leben. Unbekannte Briefe. Hrsg. von Wilhelm Schellberg und Friedrich Fuchs. (Mit 20 Abb. u. 3 Hs.-Proben). *Jena*: Diederichs [1939]. 558 pp. M. 6.50.

Carnap, Ernst Günther.—Das Schäferwesen in der deutschen Literatur des 17. Jhs. und die Hirtendichtung Europas. Diss. Frankfurt. *Würzburg*: Mayr, 1939. 81 pp.

Debus, Kurt.—Einsamkeit und Stille in der Dichtung Adalbert Stifters. Diss. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Kalinowski & Debus, 1939. 89 pp.

Dzialas, Ingrid.—Auffassung und Darstellung der Elemente bei Goethe. Diss. Frankfurt. [Germanische Studien. H. 216]. Berlin: Ebering, 1939. 171 pp. M. 6.60.

Faesi, Robert.—Gottfried Keller. [Aus: Grosse Schweizer. 1938]. Zürich: Atlantis-Verl. [1938]. 11 pp.

— Heinrich Leuthold. [Aus: Grosse Schweizer, 1938]. Zürich: Atlantis-Verl. [1938]. 4 pp.

Gesamtkatalog, Deutscher. Hrsg. von der Preuss. Staatsbibliothek. Bd. 14. Beauchamp—Beethordnung. Berlin: Preussische Druckerei- und Verlags-A. G. 1939. 960 cols. folio. M. 85.

Grimm, Herman.—Das Leben Goethes, Neubearb. u. eingeleitet von Reinhard Buchwald. [Kröners Taschenausgabe. Bd. 162]. Stuttgart: Kröner [1939]. xl, 512 pp. M. 4.75.

Grossrieder, Hans.—Reinhard Johannes Sorges "Bettler." Der Schöpfungsgang des ersten expressionistischen Dramas. Diss. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1939. 112 pp.

Hahn, Walter v.—Darmstädter Familiennamen bis zum Ende des 16. Jhs. Mit einer Karte. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. 69]. Giessen: von Münchow, 1939. 74 pp. M. 2.50.

Heckel, Hermann.—Das ethische Wortfeld in Wolframs Parzival. Diss. Erlangen. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1939. 112 pp. M. 3.

Heselhaus, Clemens.—Anton Ulrichs Aramena. Studien zur dichterischen Struktur d. deutschbarocken "Geschichtgedicht." Diss. Münster. [Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie. H. 9]. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1939. 117 pp. M. 3.30.

Hoffmann, Oliva.—Die Menschengestaltung in C. F. Meyers Renaissance-Novellen. Diss. Hamburg. [Germanische Studien. H. 219]. Berlin: Ebering, 1940. 207 pp. M. 8.10.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Hrsg. von der Ges. f. deutsche Philologie in Berlin. (Jg. 57). N. F. Bd. 15. Bibliographie 1935. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1939. 340 pp. M. 16.

[Kippenberg, Anton.]—Ihrem Präsidenten Herrn Professor Dr. Julius Petersen huldigt an seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag, dem 5. Nov. 1938, die Stadelmann-Gesellschaft. [Darin: Goethe: Vollmondnacht, Faksimile]. [Schriften d. Stadelmann-Ges. Bd. 19]. [Weimar: Stadelmann-Ges., 1938]. 5 leaves, 4°.

— Bibliographie Kippenberg. Verzeichnis der von Prof. Dr. Anton Kippenberg verfassten, herausgegebenen und übersetzten Schriften und Aufsätze. Als Hs. gedruckt. [Zum 65. Geburtstag am 22. Mai 1939, von Julius Rodenberg]. Leipzig: [Offizin Haag-Drugulin] 1939. 65 pp.

Koschlig, Manfred.—Grimmelshausen und seine Verleger. Untersuchungen über die Chronologie seiner Schriften und den Echtheitscharakter der frühen Ausgaben. Diss. Berlin. [Palaestra. 218]. Leipzig: Akad. Verlagsges. 1939. viii, 308 pp. M. 25.

Krüger, Hans Karl.—Berliner Romantik und Berliner Judentum. Mit zahlreichen bisher unbekannten Briefen und Dokumenten. Diss. Teildruck. Bonn: Röhrscheid [1939]. 143 pp. M. 3.80.

Kühnhold, Ingeburg.—Seifrits Alexander. Diss. Berlin. Dresden: Dittert, 1939. 141 pp.

Lohmeyer, Dorothea.—Faust und die Welt. Zur Deutung des 2. Teiles der Dichtung. Diss. Frankfurt. Potsdam: Athenaion [1940]. 153 pp. M. 5.50.

Matthaei, R.—Versuche zu Goethes Farbenlehre mit einfachen Mitteln. Ein Aufriss der Farbenlehre mit 32 Abb. im Text. Jena: Fischer, 1939. xvi, 130 pp. M. 2.50.

Michels, Josef.—Adalbert Stifter. Leben, Werk und Wirken. Mit 8 Kunstdrucktafeln. Berlin: Zsolnay, 1939. 315 pp. M. 4.50.

Mörke, Eduard.—Briefe. Hrsg. von Friedrich Seebass. Tübingen: R. Wunderlich [1939]. xxv, 876 pp. M. 9.50.

Müller, Irmgard.—Gerhart Hauptmann und Frankreich. Diss. [Sprache und Kultur der germ. u. roman. Völker. C, Bd. 18]. Breslau: Priebatsch, 1939. ix, 184 pp. M. 7.50.

Otto, Walter.—Der griechische Göttermythos bei Goethe und Hölderlin. [Schriften f. d. geist. Überlieferung. H. 2]. Berlin: H. Küpper [1939]. 47 pp. M. 1.75.

Petersen, Julius.—Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos. Grenzfragen zur Gegenwartform des Dramas. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940. 61 pp. M. 2.85.

Petsch, Robert.—Die lyrische Dichtkunst. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen. [Handbücherei der Deutschkunde. Bd. 4]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1939. 154 pp. M. 3.20.

Piwonka, Hubert.—Handbuch der deutschen Lyrik. Mit zahlreichen bisher unveröffentlichten Beiträgen bedeutender deutscher Dichter. Wien, Leipzig: Saturn-Verl. 1940. 205 pp. M. 7.50.

Rosenfeld, Hans-Friedrich.—Mittelniederländische Reimchroniken. Mit 1 Taf. in Lichtdruck. [Aus: Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique. 13]. Greifswald: Bamberg, 1939. 145 pp. M. 3.60.

Utschmann, Georg.—Der morphobiologische Vollkommenheitsbegriff bei Goethe und seine problemgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge. Diss. Aus d. Ernst-Haeckel-Haus, Anst. f. Gesch. d. Zoologie, insbes. d. Entwicklungslehre d. Univ. Jena. Jena: Fischer, 1939. vi, 103 pp. M. 4.50.

Waidson, H. M.—F. M. Klingers Stellung

zur Geistesgeschichte seiner Zeit. Diss. Leipzig. *Dresden*: Dittert, 1939. 130 pp.

Walter, Daniel. — Zum Rätsel um die Wanderungen Walthers von der Vogelweide. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Lösung. [*Graz*: 1937]. 43 pp.

— Hagen-Hödur. Ein Beitrag zu einer südgermanischen Edda. [*Graz*: 1939]. Pp. 5-24. M. 1.

Wehrli, Max. — Johann Jakob Bodmer. [Aus: Grosse Schweizer. 1938]. *Zürich*: Atlantis-Verl. 7 pp.

— Salomon Gessner. [Aus: Grosse Schweizer. 1938]. *Zürich*: Atlantis-Verl. 5 pp.

FRENCH

Alessio, L.—Vocabolario dell'argot e del linguaggio popolare parigino. *Turin*: Petrini, 1939. xvi + 100 pp.

Baardman, G. G.—L'œuvre pédagogique d'A. Vinet. Paris diss. *Groningen*: Wolters, 1939.

Baurmann, W.—Vertu. Die Bedeut. d. Wortes in d. franz. Renaissance. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1939. 141 pp.

Bishop, Morris.—Ronsard Prince of Poets. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. iv + 253 pp. \$3.00.

Bouvier, B.—Henri-Frédéric Amiel. *Zürich*: Atlantis-Verlag, 1939. 8 pp.

Camerlynck-Guernier, Mme et G.-H. Camerlynck.—The Essentials of Fr. Conversation. *Paris*: Didier, 1938. 146 pp.

Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque nationale. T. CLV. Rollin-Rosenzweig. *Paris*: Impr. nat., 1939. 592 pp.

Childs, Frances S.—French Refugee Life in the U. S., 1790-1800. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. 247 pp. \$3.00.

Dauzat, Albert.—Tableau de la langue fr. *Paris*: Payot, 1939. 303 pp. Fr. 30.

Delorme, Hugues.—Poètes de Montmartre. *Joinville-le-Pont*: Carlier, 1939. 24 pp.

Fentross, P.—Studien zur Vokalsegmentierung in Südfrankreich: Die Diphthongierung offener Vokale im Cervennischen. *Hamburg* diss., 1940. 99 pp.

Friedrich, Hugo.—Die Klassiker des franz. Romans. Stendhal, Balzac, Flaubert. *Leipzig*: Bibliog. Inst., 1939. 154 pp.

Harms, K.—Personifizierungen im südfranz. Sprachgebrauch. *Hamburg* diss., 1940. 82 pp.

Harvitt, Hélène. — Representative Fr. Plays from the Fr. Theatre of Today. [Vildrac, Sarment, Bernstein, Lenormand, Claudel.] *Boston*: Heath, 1940. liv + 442 pp.

Hatcher, Anna G.—Consecutive Clauses in Old French. *Paris*: Geuthner, 1939. 40 pp.

Jonker, G. D.—Le Protestantisme et le

théâtre de langue fr. au XVI^e s. *Groningen*: Wolters, 1939. 250 pp.

Kirseck, Ilse.—Anna E. Comtesse de Noailles. *Jena* diss., 1939. 78 pp.

Lacretelle, Pierre de.—Mme de Staël et les hommes. *Paris*: Grasset, 1939. 317 pp. Fr. 24.

Lancaster, H. C.—A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century. Part IV, the Period of Racine, 1673-1700. 2 v. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. 984 pp. \$10.00.

Laroche, Dr. L.—Les Sources bourguignonnes de la "Rotisserie de la reine Pédauque" d'Anatole France. *Tournus*: Amis des arts, 1938. 14 pp.

Micks, Wilson and Olga Longi.—Fundamental French. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, 1940. xxii + 295 pp.

Painter, Sidney.—French Chivalry. Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Mediaeval France. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940. x + 179 pp. \$2.00.

Parker, C. S.—Fr. Practice Book. *Boston*: Heath (1940). xii + 287 pp.

Rees, Garnet.—Remy de Gourmont. *Paris*: Boivin (1940). x + 312 pp.

Répertoire de bibliog. fr. Fasc. IX. Arbitrage-Armieux. *Paris*: Letouzey et Ané, 1939. 128 pp.

Riveline, Maurice.—Montaigne et l'amitié. *Paris*: Alcan, 1939. ii + 268 pp. Fr. 40.

Rosenberg, Zelda.—La Persistance du subjectivisme chez les poètes parnassiens. *Paris*: Presses universitaires, 1939. ii + 183 pp.

Soufflet, Ed.—Poètes du XVI^e s. *Paris*: Hachette, 1939. 96 pp. Fr. 2.50.

Souza, Sybil de.—La Philosophie de Marcel Proust. *Paris*: Rieder, 1939. 176 pp. Fr. 20.

Spanke, Hans.—Untersuchung über die Ursprünge des romanischen Minnesangs. T. 2, Marcabrustudien. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940. viii + 119 pp.

Toulouse, Madeleine.—La Nation anglaise-allemande de l'Univ. de Paris, des origines à la fin du XV^e s. *Paris*: Sirey, 1939. 183 pp. Fr. 35.

Voltaire.—Poème sur la loi naturelle, crit. ed. F. J. Crowley. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal., 1938. 132 pp. (Pubs. of U. of Cal. at L. A.)

Wagner, R.-L.—Les Phrase hypothétiques commençant par "si" dans la langue fr., des origines à la fin du XVI^e s. *Paris*: Droz, 1939. 555 pp.

—"Sorcier" et "magicien." *Ibid.*, 1939. 292 pp.

White, Mary M.—Fr. Objective Tests. *Boston*: Heath (1940). 32 pp.

Wolf, R. H.—Der Stil der Rhetorik. *Giessen*: Roman. Sem., 1939. 95 pp.

ITALIAN

Ariosto, L.—*Carmina. Praefatus est, recensuit, italice vertit, adnotationibus instruxit A. Bolaffi. Modena: Società Tipografica modenese, 1939. 150 pp. L. 35.*

Bertoni, Giulio.—Dante. 2a ediz. corretta e rifiuta. *Milano: Bietti, 1939. 64 pp. L. 5.*

Bonnes, C.—Il dolce stil novo. Saggio critico. *Modena: Società tipografica modenese, 1939. 104 pp. L. 20.*

Campanella, T.—Epilogo magno. Testo italiano inedito con le varianti dei codici e delle edizioni latine, a cura di C. Ottaviano. *Roma: R. Accademia d'Italia, 1940. 610 pp. L. 50.*

Canuti, Francesco.—Catalogo dei manoscritti che esistevano in Urbino nella Biblioteca del Papa Clemente XI, con notizie sull'origine della famiglia Albani e la descrizione del palazzo degli Albani in Urbino. *Fano: Rossini, 1939. 60 pp. L. 5.*

Capasso, Aldo.—Studi sul Tasso Minore. Serie prima. *Genova: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1940. xii + 577 pp. L. 15.*

—Tre saggi sulla poesia italiana del Rinascimento (Boiardo, Lorenzo, Ariosto). *Genova: Emiliano degli Orfini, 1939. 408 pp. L. 25.*

Catalano, Michele (ed.).—La Spagna. Poema cavalleresco del secolo XIV, edito e illustrato da M. C. Voll. II e III. *Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1940. 400; 384 pp. L. 50 cad.*

Chiri, G.—La poesia epico-storica latina dell'Italia medioevale. *Modena: Società tipografica modenese, 1939. 138 pp. L. 35.*

Cimegotto, Cesare.—Ruzzante. *Padova: Coop. tipografica, 1939. 16 pp.*

Consoli, F. G.—Itinerario letterario. Ricerche sulla Biblioteche napoletane del secolo xvii. *Napoli: Ricciardi, 1939. 179 pp.*

—Le raccolte di Classici italiani. Saggio storico-bibliografico. *Napoli: Ricciardi, 1939. 2 voll. viii + 480 pp.*

Fogazzaro, A.—Lettere scelte, a cura di T. Gallarati Scotti. *Milano: Mondadori, 1940. 750 pp. con 7 ritratti e 3 autografi. L. 50.*

Galletti, Alfredo.—Il Novecento. (Storia letteraria d'Italia). 2a ediz. riveduta ed aumentata. *Milano: F. Vallardi, 1939. xxii + 677 pp. L. 70.*

Ginori Conti, Piero.—Vita e opere di Pietro di Dante Alighieri, con documenti inediti. *Firenze: Fondazione Ginori Conti, 1939. 220 pp. con tre tavole.*

Goldoni, C.—Tutte le opere, a cura di G. Ortolani. Vol. IV. *Milano: Mondadori, 1940. 1792 pp. leg. L. 60. (I classici Mondadori.)*

Machiavelli, N.—Opere, a cura di A. Panella.

Vol. II: Scritti politici. *Milano: Rizzoli, 1940. 1117 pp. leg. L. 50.*

Pagano, Antonio.—Francesco Torraca. Profilo e bibliografia. *Nicotera: Ist. edit. calabrese, 1939. 111 pp. L. 10.*

Pancrazi, P.—Studi su D'Annunzio. *Torino: G. Einaudi, 1939. 146 pp. L. 12.*

Smith, W. F.—Masterpieces of Giacomo Leopardi, translated from the Italian. *Menasha, Wis.: G. Banta, 1939.*

—The Barbarian Odes of G. Carducci, translated from the Italian. *Menasha, Wis.: G. Banta, 1939.*

Sonetti burleschi e realistici dei primi due secoli. Nuova edizione riveduta e aggiornata da Luigi Russo. (Scrittori d'Italia). *Bari: Laterza, 1940. 468 pp. L. 50.*

Sorbelli, Albano.—Inventari dei manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia: Vol. LXXXI. *Trento: Firenze: Olschki, 1940. 280 pp. L. 80.*

—Storia dell'Università di Bologna. Vol. I: Il Medio Evo. *Bologna: Zanichelli, 1940. 328 pp. con 24 tavole fuori testo. L. 25.*

Vico, Giambattista.—Scritti vari e pagine sparse, a cura di F. Nicolini (Scrittori d'Italia). *Bari: Laterza, 1940. 300 pp. L. 35.*

Viscardi, Antonio.—Le origini. (Storia letteraria d'Italia). *Milano: Vallardi, 1939. xxii + 575 pp. L. 70.*

SPANISH

Castillo and Sparkman.—*España en América, segundas lecturas. Boston: Heath, 1940. viii + 115 pp.*

Martínez de Toledo.—El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho, ed. L. B. Simpson. *Berkeley: U. of Cal. Press, 1939. xi + 361 pp.*

Tiemann, H.—Lope de Vega in Deutschland. *Hamburg: Lütcke & Wulff, 1939. xv + 310 pp.*

Vossler, Karl.—Südliche Romania. *Munich: Oldenbourg, 1940. 249 pp.*

GENERAL

Bradford, F. A.—The Legal Status of Branch Banking in the U. S. *American Economists Council (1940). 32 pp.*

Erhardt-Siebold, E. von, and R. von Erhardt.—The Astronomy of Johannes Scotus Erigena. *Poughkeepsie: Vassar College, 1940. 69 pp. \$1.50.*

Hinkle and Garodnick.—Reading Knowledge Requirements and a translation service. *Raleigh: U. of N. C., 1940. 18 pp.*

Reichenkron, G.—Beiträge zur romanischen Lautlehre. *Leipzig: Gronau, 1939. xiii + 198 pp.*

Thomson, S. H.—Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the U. S. and Canada. *Boulder: U. of Col., 1940. 85 pp. (Bulletin 15.)*

1940

roll,

race.
edit.

Te-

como
Me-

ucci,
Vis.:

due
nata
Pari:

ano-
XXI:

. 80.

egna.

nelli,

. 25.

gine

ttori

. 35.

toria

1939.

en
eath,

e de
imp-
xi +

tsch-
. xv

nick:

s of
ricsa

Er-
eotus
1940.

owl-
vice.

chen
iii +

ieval
and
5 pp.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

NEW BOOKS

MUSIC AND EDGAR ALLAN POE

By MAY GARRETTSON EVANS

How great the influence of Poe on composers of music has been, and how varied and extensive their response to his magic, Miss Evans has undertaken to show in this work, which though it includes an exact and thorough bibliography is much more than a mere bibliographical study. It is a fresh contribution to the literary history of Poe, the most written about of American poets; and one's first thought is wonder that such a study has not been made before. 106 pages, \$1.75

THE CRITICAL WORKS OF JOHN DENNIS

Edited by EDWARD NILES HOOKER

Over a century and a half ago Dr. Johnson remarked that Dennis's critical works should be collected, an opinion which has been echoed by other distinguished writers from Southey to Spingarn. Wordsworth and Coleridge expressed a deep interest in Dennis's ideas, and Landor and Swinburne praised in extravagant terms his criticism and the rugged strength of his prose style. Many of his essays are rare, costly, and, in consequence, difficult of access. No American library has them all and only five have been reprinted in our century. Vol. 1, 347 pages, \$5.00

THE GATHERING OF THE WEST

By JOHN GALT

Edited with an introductory essay and a glossary by Bradford Allen Booth. *The Gathering of the West* is the only one of Galt's Scottish stories that has never been republished. It deserves a better fate, and its reappearance now on the one hundredth anniversary of Galt's death will raise, not lower, Galt's reputation. It is written with spirit and vigor, with broad lines of rich humor. 118 pages, \$1.50

NEW POETRY OF NEW ENGLAND: FROST AND ROBINSON

By ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

New Poetry of New England contains the six lectures delivered by Mr. Coffin on the Percy Graeme Turnbull Poetry Foundation at The Johns Hopkins University in 1938. Mr. Coffin, as a native of Maine, a poet of distinction, and a student of poetry, was peculiarly well qualified to give these lectures. He first draws a picture of nineteenth-century conditions under which developed the poetry of confidence, then describes the changes that have taken place in New England, resulting in idle harbors, abandoned farm-houses, and fields that are again invaded by the forest, as well as the sturdy resistance offered by certain elements of the population. 164 pages, \$2.00

REALITY AND THE POET IN SPANISH POETRY

By PEDRO SALINAS

This volume contains six lectures delivered on the Percy Graeme Turnbull Poetry Foundation of the Johns Hopkins University in 1937. Contents: I. The Reproduction of Reality: *The Poem of the Cid* and *A Ballad*; II. The Acceptance of Reality: Jorge Manrique and Calderón de la Barca; III. The Idealization of Reality: Garcilasso de la Vega; IV. The Escape from Reality: Fray Luis de León and San Juan de la Cruz; V. The Exaltation of Reality: Luis de Góngora; VI. The Revolt against Reality: José de Espronceda. Professor Salinas is a distinguished Spanish poet and was professor of Spanish language and literature at the Universities of Paris, Seville and Madrid; guest lecturer in Cambridge, Oxford and Brussels, visiting professor at Columbia and Wellesley. He has been appointed Professor of Spanish Literature at the Johns Hopkins University. Printed in English. 174 pages, \$2.00

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Interesting Spanish Texts ~



1. PÉREZ GALDÓS' *Doña Perfecta*

Adapted for early reading by WILLIAM F. BYESS, and WALTER E. STIBBEL, *University of Tennessee*. This important Spanish novel, with appeal to the mature interests of students, is presented in a vocabulary limited to the 1500 commonest Spanish words. *Illustrated*. 208 pages. \$1.20

2. *Luces de España*

By M. ROMERA-NAVARRO, *University of Pennsylvania*. A unique text that fulfills the wish of many teachers of intermediate students for informative and interesting material on the lives of Spain's illustrious sons and daughters. *Illustrated*. 314 pages. \$1.32

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

TEXTS WITH SPONTANEITY VERVE AND FRESHNESS

SPOKEN FRENCH

L. F. H. LOWE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

A brief manual of 26 sprightly selections for use in courses in conversation. This is French "as it is spoken" with imagination and appreciation. Separate vocabularies accompany each chapter.

CLAUDE AVELINE'S

VOITURE 7, PLACE 15

EDITED BY: A. K. SHIELDS AND T. J. WILSON

An exceptionally well written, and intensely interesting modern detective story. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary for intermediate class use.

HENRY HOLT & COMPANY

NEW YORK